

NOTE

JPRS publications contain information primarily from foreign newspapers, periodicals and books, but also from news agency transmissions and broadcasts. Materials from foreign-language sources are translated; those from English-language sources are transcribed or reprinted, with the original phrasing and other characteristics retained.

Headlines, editorial reports, and material enclosed in brackets [] are supplied by JPRS. Processing indicators such as [Text] or [Excerpt] in the first line of each item, or following the last line of a brief, indicate how the original information was processed. Where no processing indicator is given, the information was summarized or extracted.

Unfamiliar names rendered phonetically or transliterated are enclosed in parentheses. Words or names preceded by a question mark and enclosed in parentheses were not clear in the original but have been supplied as appropriate in context. Other unattributed parenthetical notes within the body of an item originate with the source. Times within items are as given by source.

The contents of this publication in no way represent the policies, views or attitudes of the U.S. Government.

PROCUREMENT OF PUBLICATIONS

JPRS publications may be ordered from the National Technical Information Service, Springfield, Virginia 22161. In ordering, it is recommended that the JPRS number, title, date and author, if applicable, of publication be cited.

Current JPRS publications are announced in Government Reports Announcements issued semi-monthly by the National Technical Information Service, and are listed in the Monthly Catalog of U.S. Government Publications issued by the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402.

Correspondence pertaining to matters other than procurement may be addressed to Joint Publications Research Service, 1000 North Glebe Road, Arlington, Virginia 22201.

19 January 1983

USSR REPORT
POLITICAL AND SOCIOLOGICAL AFFAIRS

No. 1355

CONTENTS

INTERNATIONAL

Economic Policy of American Conservatism (A. Mel'nikov; EKONOMICHESKIYE NAUKI, Oct 82).....	1
Increasing CIA Covert Activities Surveyed (V. Petrusenko; INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS, Oct 82).....	12
Work of USSR-FRG Friendship Society Praised (L. Zamyatin; IZVESTIYA, 2 Dec 82).....	20
U.S. Criticized for Policy Toward Namibia, OAU (K. Geyvandov; IZVESTIYA, 7 Dec 82).....	23
Mauritian Leaders Interviewed on Socioeconomic, Foreign Policies (IZVESTIYA, 9 Dec 82).....	27
Madrid Meeting Urged To Call Conference on Confidence- Building Measures (F. Konstantinov; KRASNAYA ZVEZDA, 15 Dec 82).....	29
Papers Mark Yugoslav National Holiday (PRAVDA, 28 Nov 82, KRASNAYA ZVEZDA, 28 Nov 82).....	32
'PRAVDA' Comment 'KRASNAYA ZVEZDA' Comment	
Gloomy Outlook Seen for FRG Free Democrats (PRAVDA, 6 Dec 82).....	35
Uzbek Academician Refutes Western Distortions (TASS, 23 Dec 82).....	38

Briefs

CSSR Federal Assembly Aide	40
Hungarian Official Visits	40
USSR-Romanian Trade Ministers	40
Norwegian Journalists in Uzbekistan	40

NATIONAL

Unregulated Brigades, Farm Leaders Experience Difficult Relations (Yuriy Mikhaylov; ZHURNALIST, Oct 82).....	41
Muslim Spiritual Directorates Announce Death of Babakhan (Editorial Report).....	47
Obkom Secretary on Multinational Assistance to Nonchernozem (Editorial Report).....	47
TV, Radio Change Function of Print Media (Editorial Report).....	47

REGIONAL

Uzbek SSR: Constitution, Union Republic Status (U. Sadykov; OBSHCHESTVENNYE NAUKI V UZBEKISTANE, No 9, 1982).....	48
---	----

ECONOMIC POLICY OF AMERICAN CONSERVATISM

Moscow EKONOMICHESKIYE NAUKI in Russian No 10, Oct 82 pp 69-77

[Article by A. Mel'nikov, professor, doctor of economics]

[Text] In the beginning of the 1980's a turn occurred in the economic policy of the ruling circles of the United States in the methods of state influence on the economy. It did not at all touch upon the basic strategic goal of guaranteeing the most favorable conditions for reproduction of the national monopolistic capital and all possible strengthening of economic and political positions of the financial oligarchy. On the contrary, the meaning of the term was to attempt to have a more complete achievement of this goal. The set of tactical resources used to solve this main task became different.

Theoretical concepts of J. Keynes dominated for over 40 years in the political economy of the United States and other countries of the West. However, under the insurmountable pressure of the facts of economic life, the efficiency of the Keynesian theory in the 1970's and 1980's began to be increasingly doubted. The theories of the monetarists and especially the newly formed trend called the supply side theory, more accurately the theory of "stimulation of investments" (private) began to be heard more than previously. This theory was highly crystallized as an economic concept of the American right conservatism.

Strengthening of the conservative trends in the bourgeois political economy and the turn towards new methods of state influence on the U.S. national economy are not accidental. They were due not only to the obviousness that the formulas of J. Keynes and his modern proponents "do not work." A political factor also played a large role: the advent to leadership of the country representatives of the right-conservative faction of American bourgeoisie headed by R. Reagan.

The followers of J. Keynes, implementing his idea of expanding state regulation of the private economy, support an active budget policy. They believe that the broad use by the government of tax levers and expenditures of the state budget will support a high demand, and from this follows the "complete" employment with stable price level. In this case it was taken into consideration that the government could have a deficit financing in order to stimulate demand, if the expenditures of the budget exceed its incomes. This means that for "cooling" of inflation, the government must accumulate "surpluses" by raising taxes or reducing its expenditures. In this case, in the opinion of the Neokeynesian there

exists a direct link between inflation and unemployment: in order to reduce the rise in prices, one can, they say, permit a higher unemployment which will constrict the volume of demand, and this means, limit the rise in prices. Correspondingly, a decrease in unemployment is interpreted as a factor for intensifying inflation. It is also believed that the latter must be reduced during economic crises.

According to these ideas, the budget and fiscal activity of the state actually drastically rose. This period was manifest primarily in a multiple increase in the expenditures of the state budget which were (in billion dollars)²:

1962	106.8
1971	211.4
1975	326.2
1977	402.7
1980	579.6
1981	657.2

The increase in state expenditures for one year alone recently reached 100 billion, and in the last 20 years the state expenditures as a whole have increased 8-fold. In the 1983 budget year it will be brought to \$800 billion. The percentage of the total federal expenditures in the gross national product rose from 15 percent in 1949 to 22.1 percent in 1981.

This situation resulted in a drastic increase in the deficit of the federal budget, since expenditures were much greater than the income. Starting in 1962 the budget was only once (in 1969) reduced with a positive balance. There was a large deficit in all the other years. In the last financial year which ended on 30 September 1981, the expenditures exceeded the incomes by \$57.9 billion³, the total state debt reached a giant sum, \$1 trillion.⁴

In all of this the Keynesian macroeconomic regulation not only did not solve the main strategic task, to eliminate the crises and the cyclic fluctuations in the economy, but, on the contrary, resulted in serious crisis drops in production, combined with a rapid onset of inflation, preservation of high unemployment and stable rise in prices. An economic situation developed which was called "stagflation." All of these processes became characteristic for the 1970's. In this period, as noted in the report of the Congressional Joint Economic Committee, "the American economy agonizingly suffered because of the unacceptably high standards of inflation and unemployment, as well as slow growth."⁵ This report makes a comparison of the economic indicators reproduced in Table 1.

It is apparent from Table 1 that in the mid 1970's, beginning of the 1980's as compared to the two previous decades, the rates of inflation rose 3.6-fold, the unemployment standard 1.5-fold with a simultaneous significant reduction in rates of growth and the gross national product.

During the discussion of the economic report of the president in February 1981, the Secretary of the Treasury of the United States D. Regan isolated a number of problems which had developed in the past years because of the economic policy of

TABLE 1. ECONOMIC INDICATORS OF THE UNITED STATES IN 1950-1980, INCREASE ON THE AVERAGE PER YEAR, %*

Indicators	1950-1972	1973-1980
Standard of inflation (rise in the price index of consumer goods)	2.5	8.9
Standard of unemployment (specific weight of unemployed in the work force)	4.8	6.8
Standard for growth in the gross national product	3.9	3.8

*See: The 1981 Midyear Report: Productivity Report of the Joint Economic Committee, Congress of the United States, July 23, Washington, 1981, p 9.

the United States up to then: rise in unemployment; high inflation; unstable high discount rate; low standard of savings and investments; low level of development of labor productivity; low rates of increase in the real gross national product.⁶ This list, as we say, is very broad and concerns the most important economic indicators. It, like the figures presented in Table 1, reflects the serious disorders in the internal mechanism of the American economy.

If we make the presented list somewhat more specific, we find that the rates in the growth of the American industrial production have been strongly retarded and in 1972-1978 were only 1 percent on the average for the year, while in Japan it was 5, and in the FRG 4 percent.⁷ During the 1970's and in the early 1980's, the United States underwent four economic crises, including the deepest and longest in the post-war period, the economic crisis of 1973-1975. The problem of labor productivity elicits especial concern among the economists and in the ruling circles of the United States. In the last three post-war decades, the American economy was one of the most productive in the world. Its level even now is higher than other capitalist countries.⁸ But in recent years, the growth rate of productivity has steadily declined: in 1950-1965 it averaged 3 percent per year, during 1965-1973 2.4, and in 1973-1980 only 0.6 percent per year. During the three years completing this period (1978, 1979, 1980) its absolute cut-back occurred. If we adopt 1977 as 100 percent, then in 1978 the level of labor productivity was 99.8, in 1980 99 percent.⁹ An absolute drop in labor productivity continued: in the private sector (outside agriculture) it diminished in the second quarter of 1981 to 0.9 percent.¹⁰

These negative phenomena are primarily associated with the existence of enormous unused potentialities in the industry of the United States. In September 1981 only 78.5 percent of the facilities were used in the processing industry, i.e., almost 22 percent of the equipment was inactive,¹¹ and in June 1982 the average total load of the production facilities reached the lowest level in the last 7 years and was 69.8 percent.¹² The enormous underuse of the productive forces was not due to the imaginary "universal abundance" (according to an official estimate, 34 million people in the country live in a state of physical poverty, and by the way, this is externally clearly visible on the streets of American cities), but by the insufficient solvent demand of the population. The presence of underloaded

facilities, in turn, did not stimulate new investments, and as a consequence, resulted in a decrease in outlays for research and development from 3 percent of the gross national product in the beginning of the 1970's to 2 percent at the end of the previous decade.¹³ As a result, the process of typical renewal of production was constricted and the specific weight of the older equipment increased. The average service life of the equipment in American industry in 1978 was 16-17 years, while in the FRG it was 12, and in Japan only 10 years.¹⁴ All of this naturally resulted in decrease in labor productivity.

Other factors also influence the dynamics of labor productivity. The rapid influx into the market of the hired labor of women and young people, especially young people 16-19 years-old and representatives of national minorities which have lower experience and skill in the final analysis reduced the total level of labor productivity.¹⁵ In the extracting industry, the labor productivity significantly dropped as a consequence of complication of the natural conditions of extracting oil, gas, coal and other raw materials, as well as a result of market changes. Some American economists name as one of the reasons for the trend towards decrease in labor productivity the rise in employment in the service sphere where labor productivity is much lower than the national level.

Slowing down of the investment activity and the process of innovations was one of the reasons for decrease in the competitiveness of the products of American firms both on world markets and within the country. Thus, whereas in Japan an average of 33 percent of the gross national product was aimed at forming basic capital in 1970-1979, in the United States it was only 17.5 percent. Even in the FRG and France the corresponding indicator was 23 percent. In some sectors of the Japanese industry, labor productivity is already higher than the United States. For example, Japan spends an average of 1.9 h on the production of one color television, while the United States spends 3.5-4.5 h. In this case the expenditures for wages in Japan is half that of the United States.¹⁶ Whereas the American firms spend 100 h on the production of a new car, the Japanese only spend 50 h.¹⁷ All of this allows the Japanese countries to successfully compete with the American producers even in the domestic market of the United States.

As already indicated, contrary to the postulates of the Keynesians, reduction in the growth rates of productivity was not at all accompanied by a drop in prices. On the contrary, whereas in 1960-1973 the prices for consumer goods rose an average by 3.2 percent (this was considered a sign of "healthy" demand), in 1973-1978 they rose by 8, in 1978-1979 already by 11.3 percent.¹⁸ Drops were combined with high and rising inflation. The rise in prices (by 11-13 percent per year) adopted threatening scales.

Whereas in the 1950's-1960's the real income of the workers under pressure of their class impact significantly rose, at the end of the 1970's the prices began to outdistance the rise in the nominal wages. As a result, the real wages began to fall. The living wage increased with a rise in prices for goods and services. According to the last calculations of the Office of Labor Statistics, of the U.S. Department of Labor, the living wage for an urban family of four (2 adults, 2 children) was the same as indicated in Table 2.

The first level presented in the table characterizes the lowest limit of the standard of living, this means that all the families are living in rented housing, 35-50 percent of the families do not have their own cars. The second level designates the living wage proper, indicates the income necessary for "moderate, but adequate" traditional living needs: 75 percent of the families of this category live in their own houses in the suburbs, the majority have their own, but old cars.¹⁹ The third level is the indicator of income which guarantees a standard of living of so-called "middle class" 85 percent of the families have their own houses and all have cars. Under specific American conditions, all these three indicators, no matter how different they are, actually are at the level of the living wage. Its growth is due to the high level of prices for many consumer services and goods. In November 1981, a small family home in the suburbs of California cost \$130,000, a two-room apartment in Brooklyn cost \$375 per month, and a trip on a bus in New York cost 65¢, a two-egg omelette (not in a restaurant) \$2.50, an omelette with pieces of bacon \$3.95, a loaf of bread about \$1, a man's haircut \$6-15, a scientific book \$15-20, tickets for a small theater presentation on Broadway in New York \$23-25.²⁰ It should be stressed that the average wages of the workers in U.S. economy does not even reach the "lowest" indicator of the living wage, and in relation to the "average" indicator is approximately 56 percent.²¹

TABLE 2. LIVING WAGE OF AN URBAN FAMILY (in \$) PER YEAR*

Living Wage	Autumn 1980	Autumn 1981
Lowest	14,044	15,323
Middle	23,134	25,661
Highest	34,409	38,060

*Calculated according to: Autumn 1980 Urban Family Budgets and Comparative Indexes for Selected Urban Areas. News U.S. Department of Labor, April 1981, Washington, p 2; U.S. NEWS AND WORLD REPORT, 1982, May 3, p 81.

Thus, there is a serious break in the internal mechanism of the U.S. economy. The appearance of the book of the known American economist Professor L. Thurow "Zero-Sum Society" is symptomatic. The author titled the first chapter of his book: "The Economy Which Does Not Work." Decrease in rates of growth, inflation, unemployment, the energy problem, deterioration in the environment, rise in inequality of incomes, L. Thurow notes that the list of these painful problems is infinite. "One hears more often in America complaints: economic and political system of the country has lost the capacity to solve its own problems."²² Coming to political power, the American conservatives announced that the economic difficulties of the country are a consequence of the inaccurate policy of their predecessors who started from the Keynesian theory. Counter to the viewpoints of the followers of J. Keynes (whose influence, by the way, is sufficiently weighty even now²³) economic views of the right-conservative line began to be actively disseminated. Based on the latter, "Reaganomics" developed, a set of specific economic measures conducted by the current American government. This set, published in the economic program of R. Reagan adopted in February 1981 as a "new beginning for healing America," includes four basic measures.

1. New budget policy. President Reagan has proclaimed a reduction in expenditures of the state budget, decrease in its deficit to \$42 billion in 1982 and complete balancing of the incomes and expenditures in 1984. The main goal is to limit the growth in inflation. Its rates have acquired politically dangerous scales and cause serious social dissatisfaction, fraught with explosion. One famous American sociologist has named inflation as the main question of the class conflict at the modern stage. If the government of R. Reagan does not succeed in halting it, and the Democrats advance if only an externally similar alternative, the workers and many other laborers will vote for the Democrats. In addition, the inflationary fluctuations in prices increase risk associated with new private capital investments, and to a certain measure limit the investment process. These reasons also explain the task advanced by R. Reagan to balance the budget; decrease in its expenditures must be implemented mainly through a drastic cutting of social programs.

2. New tax policy. The program of reducing taxes by stages has been adopted: by 5 percent starting in October 1981, by 10 percent starting 1 July 1982, and by another 10 percent in 1983. The goal is to increase the savings of individuals with large incomes, i.e., the major bourgeoisie, so that it would place more money into the economy. In discussing the program of R. Reagan in the Joint Economic Committee of Congress, its chairman G. Reuss noted that as a result of reducing the taxes of the family with annual income over \$50,000, an additional \$35 billion will be obtained. A family with annual income of \$200,000 will gain \$30,000, while a family with income of \$15,000, will only save \$400 per year because of the decrease in taxes.²⁴

It is hypothesized that the rise in "savings" of the major monopolistic bourgeoisie will increase the volume of capital investments. This will revitalize the economy and result in technical renewal of production, and rise in labor productivity. It is considered that there will be a simultaneous increase in employment and as a result, the total mass of tax income will not be reduced. A favorable tax situation for the monopolistic corporation is created by writing off from taxes the expenses for accelerated amortization and tax rebates for financing long-term contributions. The period for compensation for cost of machines and equipment is only established for 5 years, cars and equipment needed for technical development and research, 3 years, building of plants, stores and wholesale bases 10 years. It is understandable that this accelerated amortization will provide great advantages for corporations.

3. Rigid control by the Federal Reserve System of the circulation of money and credit rates. The purpose is to control inflation, since in the last decade the standard of growth in the monetary mass has exceeded the rate of growth of goods and services. There is yet another goal of strengthening the international position of the dollar (high discount rate in banks should attract foreign capital, interest in converting it into dollars) and strengthening of the competitiveness of the American corporations.

4. Decrease in the volume of state regulation. The purpose is to completely untie the hands of "big business." Under the supervision of Vice President G. Bush, a special commission has been set up for "deregulation." It reviews all

of the previously adopted acts establishing definite requirements for the manufactured products. The majority of the "regulating" rules have been replaced or reduced.

The program of R. Reagan has an eclectic and extremely contradictory nature. On the whole the task is set of eliminating the crisis of the state-monopolistic regulation by switching to a mechanism of market economy. But the abandoning of regulation is only being declared. The actual methods of state-monopolistic regulation are being preserved. The fact is merely that instead of regulating demand preached by the Neokeynesians, the accent is on stimulating private investments with the help of the formation of large savings among large capitalists. The class nature of "Reagonomics" is obvious: it expresses the interests of a monopolistic bourgeoisie.

Specific measures which compile the program of R. Reagan are in a contradiction. The task is set of balancing the state budget, but it contradicts the course for an unprecedented militarization of the country which inevitably causes an avalanche-like growth in military expenditures and increases the budget deficit. The most important is the goal of stimulating economic growth, but its realization is undermined by the constriction of the solvent demand of a considerable part of the population because of the rise in unemployment and elimination of many (for more than \$40 billion) social programs. Finally, the attempt to stimulate new investments (by reducing taxes, by tax rebates for corporations) encounters a rigid monetary policy, which is being used to try to halt the inflationary growth in prices by limiting the monetary mass and establishing excessively high discount rate. The record increase in the cost of credit (The Federal Reserve System has brought the discount rate to 17-20 percent) restricts the potentialities for using the bank credits for the development of production. The already mentioned famous American economist J. Tobin compared the program of R. Reagan with a train where two locomotives have been placed at different ends. They move the train in completely opposite directions. "The result of this out-balancing of the cable," Tobin announced in an interview with the magazine U.S. NEWS AND WORLD REPORT, "is that the presidential train has become stuck, and we are now in a deep crisis."²⁵ This evaluation is quite correct.

The economic program of the American conservatism is no longer merely a summary of theoretical postulates, it has long, 1.5 years, been implemented, although with a number of corrections. What are its first detected results?

The rate of inflation has been somewhat brought down: in May 1982, the prices for consumer goods rose in an annual computation by 7-8 percent, a lower rate than previously, but very high. As compared to the last period and some other foreign currencies, the position of the dollar was somewhat improved, although, in the official quotation of \$42 for Troy ounce, the price of gold is \$342.²⁶ The high discount rates intensify the migration of foreign capital to American banks (which, by the way, aggravated even more the contradictions with the West European competitors, especially in France).

Of definite importance is the fact that the main goal, increasing production investments to the American economy, has clearly not been achieved by the administration of R. Reagan. The majority of the bourgeoisie politically supports R.

Reagan. But at the same time, the capitalists are very cautious about the new investment of money into the economy, therefore they do not hurry to spend it productively. The chairman of the Board of Directors of the second largest bank in the United States Citicorp Walter Wriston in response to the question about the future of new investments of capital explained that "business will only be interested when there is a firm hope of the return of money with profit. But today, when there is a high discount rate, the corporations prefer to earn by contributing to financial assets (certificates, etc.), and not to plants and equipment. They will not act differently until there is confidence of an end to the decline, and the discount rate goes down."²⁷ However, this confidence does not exist. Thus, none of the participants of the two-day meetings of the prestigious "Business Board," consisting of the heads of the 50 largest corporations of the country did not predict a renewal in the economy in the near future. The chairman of the Board of Directors of American Telephone and Telegraph C. Brown announced: "Now the plans for increasing facilities are deceptive. A lot of time will pass before anyone decides to expand production again."²⁸ Therefore, despite the enormous gain of \$152.8 billion from reducing taxes on corporations, their investments remain listless and even, according to the expression of the magazine U.S. NEWS AND WORLD REPORT, "wither": private investments to the main capital dropped from \$449.5 billion in the second quarter of 1981 to \$430 billion in the first quarter of 1982.²⁹

The drastic reduction in allocations for social needs which in the last 2 years have diminished by \$50 billion,³⁰ decreases the solvent demand of large groups of the population, which as a result aggravates the crisis processes. The magazine NEWSWEEK writes that the economic policy of R. Reagan "polarizes America," the gap between the rich and the poor rises. A total of 2 million people are suffering from the reduction in the food stamp program, \$1.9 billion have been "cut" for the medical insurance program which covers 22 million poor, especially elderly. There has been a 20-30-80 percent decrease in different school programs (in particular, payment for school lunches). Despite the rising unemployment, there was a \$2 billion decrease in the programs for guaranteeing employment, etc. According to calculations, the effect from reducing the income tax and simultaneous drastic decrease in social expenditures is the following: families with annual income of \$80,000 and more gained \$15,000 per year, while families with income of \$10,000 gained \$240.³¹ But if the first is the minority, the second group of families represents a considerable part of the population.

Thus, the economic policy of R. Reagan deals a serious blow to the standard of living of many workers, at the same time, with regard for the "waiting" position of "big business" a decrease in the volume of the domestic market occurs which is not at all compensated for by the rising military consumption. This precisely explains the fact that in the period of the most active implementation of the economic program of R. Reagan, there is not a weakening, but on the contrary, an aggravation of the economic crisis. Starting in June 1981, the economic indicators drastically dropped. During this time the index of business activity diminished from 125 (1967=100) to 102.4 in May 1982.³² In other words, the American economy has now been thrown back to the 1967 level.

The crisis drop in production increased unemployment to a record level since 1958: 10.8 million people (9.4 percent of the civilian work force).³³ Among

the Blacks (men) there are 16 percent unemployed. There are 22 percent of young people ages 16-19 without work (42 percent among the Blacks). Unemployment has touched a number of the white-collar workers: 4.6 percent of the white-collar workers are looking for employment.³⁴

None of the American economists, even the conservative line, negates the existence of a deep economic crisis. Discrepancy only exists in one area: has the "bottom" of the crisis been passed, or will the economic situation deteriorate even further? Many predictions of R. Reagan and his followers that "a rise is beginning," are no longer confirmed, and some economists believe that the current crisis will exceed the scales of the 1974-1975 crisis, and consequently, will be the deepest in the post-war history of the United States.

Thus, the administration has not yet succeeded in stimulating private investment, and at the same time revitalizing the economy. But other key points of the economic program of R. Reagan have also not been fulfilled. In order to hold back inflation, he promised to drastically reduce the deficit in the state budget this year, but contrary to his predictions, the deficit not only will not be reduced, but will be increased sharply, almost double: up to \$100.5 billion.³⁵

This is not surprising, since the government of R. Reagan, conducting an extremely militarist policy, increased the military expenditures of the state to a record sum: over \$227 billion per year. Even a drastic reduction in social programs does not compensate for the enormous rise in military outlays. The president was forced to publicly abandon his promise to balance the budget by 1984. The American specialists predict that the budget deficit will rise, and will possibly reach the record level \$104 billion in 1983,³⁶ \$216 billion in 1984, and \$232 billion in 1985,³⁷ i.e., the total deficit during the years of the stay of R. Reagan in the White House will exceed \$700 billion. At the same time the task of eliminating one of the important reasons for the inflationary rise in prices has not been solved. On the contrary, there are grounds to assume that under conditions of the great imbalance in the budget, new waves of inflationary process are possible.

The suggestion of Reagan advanced most recently to increase taxes by \$100 billion in the next 3 years will mean a forced open abandoning of one of the main principles of the theory of "supply" and "Reaganomics."

The gaps in the economic program of R. Reagan have serious social-political consequences. The wave of criticism of the head of the White House is rising in the country. Thus, 52 percent of questioned Americans announced that they did not want to see R. Reagan president of the country in 1984 (35 percent were for, and 13 percent did not have an opinion).³⁸ One of the eloquent proofs of the acknowledgement of the unsoundness of economic policy of the current administration, even in the ruling circles of the country, could be the statement of the former assistant secretary of the treasury on economic questions P. Roberts: "the administration no longer has a policy. The people who develop it are acting, depending on where the wind blows on this day."³⁹ Of course, the series of resignations of the closest colleagues of R. Reagan, including the heads of the group of economic advisers under president M. Weidenbaum is not at all an accident. It is understandable that the working masses will show an even stronger dissatisfaction with the economic policy of the American conservatives who came

to power. Reflecting this indisputable position, representatives of many trade unions, mass organizations uniting the national minorities actively protest "Reaganomics." They state directly that R. Reagan is fighting inflation by increasing unemployment, at the expense of the workers. The depth of the current crisis was the result of the conservative combination of stimulation of the capitalists with the help of tax reform with monetarist worship of the spontaneous market forces.

FOOTNOTES

1. By fiscal policy is meant the government strategy of using taxes, budget expenditures, and loans in order to influence economic activity.
2. Compiled according to U.S. NEWS AND WORLD REPORT, 1981, February 15, p 18.
3. See: U.S. NEWS AND WORLD REPORT, 1982, February 15, p 72.
4. See *ibid.* p 18.
5. The 1981 Midyear Report: Productivity. Report of the Joint Economic Committee, Congress of the United States, July 23, Washington, 1981, p 8.
6. See: The 1981 Economic Report of the Presidential Hearing Before the Joint Economic Committee of Congress of the United States, part 2, Washington, 1981, p 106.
7. See Thurow, L. The Zero-Sum Society, New York, 1980, p 5.
8. If the production of the GNP for one worker in the United States is taken as 100 percent, then in Canada this indicator equals 94.8 percent, in Holland 93, in Belgium 90.7, in France 88.8, in the FRG 87.9, in Japan 66.4 and in Great Britain 59.5 percent (see: The 1981 Midyear Report: Productivity., *op. cit.*, p 5).
9. See: The 1981 Midyear Report: Productivity., *op. cit.* pp 2-3.
10. See: Productivity and Costs, News. U.S. Department of Labor, Washington, July 1981, p 5.
11. See: THE NEW YORK TIMES, 1981, October 20, p 8.
12. See: PRAVDA, 1981, 26 July, p 5.
13. See: Thurow, L., *op. cit.*, p 85.
14. See: President Reagan's Economic Program. Hearing Before the Joint Economic Committee of Congress of the United States, March 30, 1981, pp 91-92.
15. Thus the percentage of women in the civilian work force of the United States rose from 37.8 percent in 1960 to 52.3 percent in 1981 (see: U.S. NEWS AND WORLD REPORT, 1982, March 22, p 52).

16. See: President Reagan's Economic Program, Op. cit., pp 35, 36, 41.
17. See: The 1981 Midyear Report: Productivity. Op. cit. p 5.
18. See: President Reagan's Economic Program, Op. cit., p 23.
19. The United States, as is known, the public transportation has been poorly developed and is extremely expensive (for example, a ride on the subway in New York costs 75¢). Therefore a personal car is not a luxury item here, but a first necessity, without which it is extremely difficult, and often impossible to live and work.
20. The author encountered these prices during a scientific business trip in the United States at the end of 1981.
21. See: MONTHLY LABOR REVIEW, October 1981, p 74.
22. Thurow, L. Op. cit., p 9.
23. One of the American Keynesians, Professor James Tobin (former advisor to J. Kennedy) was awarded the Nobel Prize in 1981.
24. See: The 1981 Economic Report of the President. Op. cit., p 98.
25. U.S. NEWS AND WORLD REPORT, 1982, February 1, p 46.
26. See ibid., May 31, p 54.
27. U. S. NEWS AND WORLD REPORT, 1982, May 31, p 27.
28. TIME, 1982, May 17, p 48.
29. See: U.S. NEWS AND WORLD REPORT, 1982, May 31, p 29.
30. See: PRAVDA, 1982, 26 July, p 5.
31. See: NEWSWEEK, 1982, April 5, p 38.
32. See: U.S. NEWS AND WORLD REPORT, 1982, May 31, p 54.
33. See: U.S. NEWS AND WORLD REPORT, 1982, May 17, p 15.
34. See: Ibid., March 15, p 71, 72.
35. See: Ibid., May 31, p 25.
36. See: PRAVDA, 1982, 26 July, p 5.
37. See: U.S. NEWS AND WORLD REPORT, 1982, May 31, p 25.
38. See: Ibid., May 24, p 36.
39. PRAVDA, 1982, 26 July, p 5.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatel'stvo "Vysshaya shkola", "Ekonomicheskiye nauki", 1982.

INTERNATIONAL

INCREASING CIA COVERT ACTIVITIES SURVEYED

Moscow INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS in English No 10, Oct 82 pp 102-108, 138

[Article by V. Petrusenko: "The CIA Steps Up Subversive Activities"]

[Text]

One of the direct consequences of the hegemonic ambitions of the more reactionary circles of US imperialism is galvanized activities at all levels of the notorious US "intelligence community"¹ coordinated and guided by the Central Intelligence Agency (CIA). To still further underscore the role of intelligence in the conduct of US foreign policy, President Reagan stated in his policy-making speech late in June at CIA headquarters in Langley, that intelligence is a powerful weapon which the government has at its disposal. It should be used, he said in a "crusade for freedom". By this Washington implies the struggle against the forces of peace, socialism and social progress. One is struck by the fact that today the Washington Administration not only does not conceal facts attesting to the growing role being played by the CIA and other secret services in pursuing an aggressive foreign policy and turning the screws within the USA, but is also broadcasting them.

This is not being done fortuitously, of course. The Cuban newspaper *Granma* noted that by its actions and publicity thereof, by outright threats and blackmail, US intelligence seeks to frighten the peoples, to provoke domestic troubles in other countries, and to neutralize the movement for peace and social progress that gained momentum in the first part of the current year in Western Europe and then in the USA.

US intelligence spearheads its main blows at socialist countries, but it never lets out of its sight the young independent states and the capitalist countries where Washington feels the situation is unfavourable for its foreign policy aims or for US transnational corporations' activities.

By the time Reagan stepped into the White House the CIA was well equipped for global operations. Nonetheless, the Republican Administration deemed it necessary to introduce a number of organizational measures to bolster the CIA's efficiency and extend its functions.

CIA AT THE THRESHOLD OF THE 1990s

The point is that the CIA's recent path, as some American experts are inclined to think, has been rather "thorny". Its failures in Afghani-

¹ Apart from the CIA, the US press includes in the "community" the Defense Intelligence Agency, the Air Force Intelligence, the Office of Naval Intelligence, the Army Intelligence, the National Security Agency, intelligence services of the State, Treasury and Energy Departments, the Federal Bureau of Investigation, and the Drug Enforcement Administration.

stan, Iran and Nicaragua and setbacks in El Salvador, Guatemala, the Western Sahara, Namibia and other regions led to a credibility gap in it on the part of the White House, Congress, the military-industrial complex, and the most reactionary financial and industrial circles.

Much stronger, though qualitatively different, was the "no-confidence" reaction of the American public at large when it was angered to learn of the CIA's activities abroad, including terroristic attempts at foreign leaders' lives, and of its unconstitutional conduct at home, its violation of human rights.

This, in turn, (according to central press and former CIA agents) led to a "moral crisis" in the CIA: loss of self-confidence, constant change of personnel, top officials included. Internally, (if one is to believe press reports) there was a factional split into ultra-reactionaries, conservatives and liberals. The dismissal in the late 1970s of 2,800 staffers by the then CIA chief, Admiral Stansfield Turner, caused a smoldering dislike for the Admiral. During the 1980 election campaign the ultra-reactionaries and the conservatives decided to take revenge on Turner and on Carter who supported him. The discharged agents (many of them seasoned veterans) helped them out. They joined the Reagan camp en masse, commented Washington journalist A. Rowse, former White House official².

Reagan's choice of William Casey, a former intelligence officer, as manager of his Presidential election campaign gave them new heart. During World War II Casey was in charge of operations of the Office of Strategic Services in Europe. Then, for many years he was a Wall Street lawyer; he founded a number of companies and became a millionaire. Under President Nixon, Casey chaired the Stock Exchange Commission and the Export-Import Bank, and was Deputy Secretary of State for Economic Affairs. Republicans extolled him for his organizational abilities and his gift for collecting "donations" to the Presidential campaign fund. But this was not all. The *Covert Action* magazine, published by former CIA officials, politicians and journalists who want an end put to subversive actions, drew attention to an interesting point. Casey's appointment as chief of the Republican electoral headquarters encouraged "a cabal of renegade intelligence officers",³ discontent with US foreign policy trends. "The target of this group [during the electoral campaign—V. P.] was not just the White House, but most importantly, the Congressional committees that supervise foreign policy".⁴

The CIA worked hard during the elections to vote down moderate liberal senators like Frank Church, Chairman of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations and former Chairman of the Committee to Study Governmental Operations with Respect to Intelligence Activities; Birch Bayh, Chairman of the Senate Committee on Intelligence; former Democratic Presidential candidate George McGovern, and others. One of the methods used was the spreading of misinformation by retired secret agents members of the 3,000-strong Association of Former Intelligence Officers.

² See A. Rowse, *One Sweet Guy and What He Is Doing to You. The Promises and Perils of Reaganism*, Washington, 1981, p. 121.

³ "Renegade" cabals in the CIA—a reference to groups of the most reactionary intelligence officers who resort to various techniques of fighting the White House, Congress, the cabinet and political parties not to their liking. Independent American investigators believe that a "renegade" cabal was involved in the assassination of John and Robert Kennedy.

⁴ *Covert Action*, April 12, 1981, p. 35.

Independently and through other ultra-rightist organizations, the Association paved the way to power for the most reactionary politicians. "The campaign", stresses *Covert Action*, "was extremely successful, providing [to intelligence sections—V. P.] the leadership for all four Reagan transition teams for foreign policy, and their members and supporters have moved into numerous Administration positions... Movement, assisted by propagandists who were veterans of CIA media operations... revived the Cold War through leaks, planted stories, black propaganda, forgeries, deceptions, and scare stories. The themes have remained constant, and will undoubtedly flourish in the next several years".⁵

After the Republican candidate won the Presidential elections the special intelligence caretaker group was headed by William Middendorf, a Washington banker and former Secretary of the Navy who now represents the USA in the Organization of American States. The group immediately recommended to the new President to lift all restrictions on spy recruitment and subversive activities, which almost echoed what he had said in his election speeches about giving a free hand to intelligence.

As for Casey, he at once asked for the CIA Director's post and was immediately appointed. Moreover, the CIA chief was unprecedentedly elevated to cabinet member status. In a February 1981 interview to *Figaro Magazine* the US President explained this as follows: "Casey is an extremely talented and experienced man; he is better suited than any one else to fill this crucially important post at this moment of history, by virtue of his position he must have access to the President and equal status with the other top aides".

Other judgements are being expressed even in the USA. Specifically, the *Time* magazine characterized the new CIA Director as "a wily and tough Washington operator" ready to use the largest spy machine at his own discretion.⁶

It stands to reason that *Time* is prepared to approve of CIA activities abroad. However, in the last election campaign Casey's team, consisting of operative and retired CIA agents, displayed a good deal of ingenuity in dealing with its liberal and "moderate" political rivals and, according to the US press, accumulated a large reserve of compromising dossiers not only on Democrats, but also on their "own" associates—the Republicans. It has, therefore, become a dangerous force for both parties.

These fears underlay an attempt in the summer of 1981 to force Casey to resign. The pretext used was *The Washington Post* report on the financial machinations of Casey's protégé, Max Hugel, a New York millionaire who was CIA Deputy Director and Chief of the Directorate of Covert Operations. When Hugel was forced to resign the spotlight was put on Casey. A number of newspapers and magazines laid bare not only his financial misdeeds, but also the connections of a company he had worked for as a lawyer with organized crime. Were it not for the President's personal intervention the Congress would have made him resign.

Casey stayed not because his illegal financial deals were forgiven, but because he had been and continued to be a reliable and "ingenious" conductor of Washington's official foreign policy strategy.

The CIA's policies are shaped to fully meet the Republican Administration's foreign and military policy objectives. Under Casey the Agency joined hands with Pentagon to escalate the offensive against the policy of detente and international cooperation. Also, the larger US periodicals give Casey credit for boosting the "morale" of the "cloak and dagger" gentlemen.

⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 40.

⁶ *Time*, Aug. 10, 1981.

In the first place Casey halted the "decline" in the role of secret subversive operations which, in the opinion of the US ruling circles, had been under way since mid-1970s after severe criticism and even condemnation of 900 large-scale and thousands of smaller operations of the kind by the Church Committee.

True, many well-informed American public figures are rather sceptical about such assessments. Former US Secretary of State Henry Kissinger writes in his memoirs: "Paradoxically, American intervention in the domestic affairs of other countries has multiplied and become less discriminating since the covert operations of the CIA have come under attack... The new doctrine [which appeared as a result of CIA activities' exposures and was aimed at further camouflaging secret subversive operations—V, P.] justifies unlimited intervention to promote internal change in countries that are both friend and foe; it has been directed against countries that do not threaten our national security and that may indeed be allies of the United States."⁷

Consequently, it is not a case of the "revival", as Western observers put it, of CIA terrorist and other secret subversive operations, but their intensification on a qualitatively new basis using the experience of recent years to the full.

The prerogatives and functions of the "intelligence community" in the US Federal administrative machinery were defined in the White House directive on intelligence issued in December 1981 which indicates that institutions integrated in the intelligence system shall undertake special operations, i. e. secret subversive acts against other countries. Maximum emphasis will be made, the directive said, on encouraging competition between intelligence services in collecting and processing data. Though the CIA is assigned supervisory powers both in conducting "special operations" and in collecting intelligence, the above competition can result in its full control over all operations, except the largest and most important. Also, it is easy to imagine that in their drive for better performance, other special services may be prone to use most adventurous and bloody methods.

At hearings before the Senate' Select Committee on Intelligence chaired by reserve Air Force general (of "Neanderthal vintage") Barry Goldwater (Republican), the directive was given a warm welcome. Some amendments were made, but public warnings of very inadequate provisions for control over intelligence activities were disregarded. For instance, Mark Lynch, a lawyer from the American Civil Liberties Union, emphasized that according to the relevant bill the entire "oversight" of intelligence operations was made the function of two congressional commissions, excluding any "oversight" by the press. In his opinion, congressional control "has not been as vigorous or as effective"⁸.

Some vague references in the directive to the necessity to avoid "mistakes" and illegal operations at home and abroad were appraised by experts and the public as rhetoric exercises rather than provisions conducive to the limitation of the influence of the intelligence service in the state mechanism.

THE CIA IN THE US POLITICAL STRUCTURE

⁷ Henry Kissinger, *White House Years*, Boston, 1979, p. 658

⁸ Intelligence Reform Act of 1981. Hearings Before the Select Committee on Intelligence of the United States Senate. Ninety-Seventh Congress, First Session, Washington, 1981, p. 48.

Ever since it was founded the CIA has been a major instrument of US foreign policy. Allen Dulles, its founding father and director for almost a decade, came right to the point when he said that "the National Security Act of 1947... has given Intelligence a more influential position in our government than Intelligence enjoys in any other government in the world".⁹

Granted unlimited rights under the 1947 Act to collect and analyze strategic information "to avert another Pearl Harbour", the CIA has in the past 35 years become an integral part of the punitive arm and a major military, political and propaganda instrument of US imperialism.

Obsessed with anti-communism, anti-Sovietism, hegemonism and expansionism the US ruling circles have entrusted the CIA not only with carrying out secret operations throughout the world, but also with taking part—on special terms—in formulating and approving US foreign policy programmes in close cooperation with other agencies of executive power and with transnational corporations, yellow trade unions, non-government organizations, foundations, etc.

The CIA has elbowed its way through other secret services to rank first among the suppliers of political, military, economic, scientific and technological intelligence for the White House, the executive and legislative arms, and big business. It is in a position to impose on the executive and legislative authorities its conclusions and recommendations based on a purposeful choice and analysis of the secret information obtained, to manipulate data, rig up false strategic intelligence so as to involve the Administration and the American people in dangerous international ventures (Vietnam, the Dominican Republic, El Salvador, etc.).

The US President exercises direct authority over CIA activities either through the National Security Council or the CIA Director and his deputies. The Council comprises an inter-departmental intelligence group (apart from foreign policy and military groups) which includes heads of respective departments and their deputies, and several inter-departmental functional (military, diplomatic, foreign economic) and regional (Europe, Middle East, Latin America, etc.) sub-groups.

However, a President's order is enough for the CIA to go into action independently. For example, the Nixon-ordered subversion in Chile was known only to then CIA Director Richard Helms and Presidential National Security Adviser Henry Kissinger. This super-secrecy enables the top leaders to make believe that neither they nor the CIA are a party to a particular "dirty trick". Moreover, the secret service needs a *carte blanche* as a "guarantee" to the US government that the most dangerous deals will be pulled off by hired hands.

"The overwhelming majority of covert activities," writes Kissinger, "were first suggested by the CIA or by our ambassadors abroad; while I was in office only in the rarest of cases did the White House propose agenda items. Chile was one of these, and even there the President only gave impetus to what the 40 Committee [an inter-departmental intelligence group—V. P.] was already doing on its own". Kissinger is trying to show his best side. He claims "credit" for increased control over the secret service though the control was ridiculously insignificant: "The only change I made in the procedures I inherited," he writes, "was to require that each approved covert or reconnaissance operation be reviewed at least once a year by the 40 Committee; this was to prevent its continuation by bureaucratic inertia after the need had passed."¹⁰

⁹ Quoted from R. Anson, *They've Killed the President! The Search for the Murderers of John F. Kennedy*, New York, 1975, p. 275.

¹⁰ Henry Kissinger, *Op. cit.*, pp. 680-661.

Statements of this kind give grounds to American observers to infer that the CIA's major actions seem to be out of control only on the surface; in fact, they are undertaken in keeping with the general instructions of the President or the NSC. By applying the phrase "invisible government" to the CIA, they would just like to emphasize that with its vast potential the CIA's autonomy sometimes makes it independent in big policy matters.

Today the CIA works hard to accomplish the tasks set to it. It is therefore the only agency in the Federal government unaffected by Washington's campaign for less spending. In the mid-1970s its vast financial resources, according to the US General Accounting Office, exceeded \$16,000 million.¹¹

NEW GEOPOLITICAL OFFENSIVE

This is the title of a chapter in the bestseller by a former high-ranking CIA official, C. Meyer, who urged turning the whole US intelligence potential against the socialist countries, national liberation movements, and the Communist and Workers' Parties in Western countries. What worries him is a further possible "transformation" of the political map of the world, because that would narrow down the "Western access to scarce raw materials and strategic geographical positions" which are being "increasingly threatened with each new advance" by the peoples fighting for their liberation.¹²

Meyer's work appeared when the 1980 election campaign was in full swing; however, judging by the US press, it is still a favourite book with many statesmen. The former CIA agent's speculations smack of a pathological hatred for detente and the positive changes of the 1970s which reflects the CIA's credo of yesterday and today. When Richard Nixon and Gerald Ford sat in the Oval Office the CIA drew and several times amended a report which "exposed" detente as a "tactical stratagem" of the Soviet Union and other socialist countries. The authors of the report regretted the "lack of attention" shown to it by Reagan's predecessors. Today, according to Washington reporters Rowland Evans and Robert Novak, the Administration agrees with those CIA "assessments".¹³

The CIA and the Pentagon work in unison to push the White House to more energetic steps for increased confrontation of the USA and its West-European allies with the Soviet Union and other socialist countries, for suppression of the national liberation struggles. It throws its weight and influence around to impede a normalization of Soviet-American relations. It comes as no surprise that the CIA propaganda services jointly with their colleagues from other Washington departments and NATO secret services are playing first fiddle in the "Soviet threat" campaign.

Subversive actions against Poland have become the spearhead of the recent CIA activities directed against socialist countries. Counter-revolution in the country, pointed out Stefan Olszowski, Political Bureau Member of the Central Committee of the Polish United Workers' Party, was largely inspired from abroad. The US secret services became particularly active after martial law was declared in Poland. In view of the steps taken by the Polish authorities, a White House spokesman announced, the US "intelligence community" has been alerted.

Commenting on this decision an ABC correspondent said that the White House had ordered US intelligence to spring into action to be

¹¹ *Los Angeles Times*, Aug. 2, 1975.

¹² C. Meyer, *Facing Reality. From World Federalism to the CIA*, New York, 1980, p. 348.

informed of every step by the Polish authorities and the Soviet Union.

In addition to more intensive overall spying, the overseas secret services are trying to interfere in Polish internal affairs with the aim of destabilizing the situation in the country and preventing normalization. A major sabotage centre is the CIA-run Radio Free Europe in West Germany. The GDR magazine *Horizont* reports that its chief G. Furguson, a highly-placed CIA official, and W. Lonam, the CIA resident in West Germany, gave instructions to leaders of the Polish reactionary forces and disseminated anti-socialist and anti-Soviet propaganda material compiled by the KOS-KOR counter-revolutionary group.

The subversive and spying activities of imperialist secret services in Poland are being resolutely rebuffed by the forces which are safeguarding the socialist gains of Polish society.

The plans for a "new geopolitical offensive" place the major emphasis on the toppling of governments which do not please Washington. Leaning on reactionary forces and supplying them with arms and money, the CIA is waging an "undeclared war" against the revolutionary masses in Afghanistan, Angola, Nicaragua, El Salvador, etc. The methods and techniques used are most varied: assassination of outstanding anti-imperialist leaders, use of chemical and bacteriological weapons, misinformation, slander and deception; also, large-scale mass and individual terror intended to intimidate the population and destabilize the situation in a given country.

One specific instance was the CIA plans to kill M. Qaddafi, the leader of the Libyan revolution. The joint communique adopted in August 1981 by a meeting in Aden of the leaders of the People's Democratic Republic of Yemen, Ethiopia and Libya condemned the US policy of terror against progressive regimes and national liberation movements, as well as its plots to physically remove their leaders.

Western press also reports CIA attempts to overthrow the present government in Iran. According to *The New York Times* the CIA recruited two military units — 8,000 and 2,000-strong—from the Iranian government's enemies. The "CIA support for the two units", wrote the paper, "was said to run to millions of dollars." The USA was also providing the units with arms "... because 'it was to have some force able to enter Iran in a civil war or domestic upheaval'". The CIA has set up a special radio station, the newspaper added, "to broadcast anti-Soviet and anti-Khomeini information"¹⁸. These intrigues are fresh proof of the great importance which the USA attaches to its plans for Iran's return to the Western side.

In addition to the developing world, the CIA is also stepping up its subversive activities in many Western countries regarded by Washington as "vulnerable" particularly because of the rising wave of anti-war and democratic movements there. The series of murders of outstanding democratic and bourgeois leaders in Italy and terroristic acts against, and kidnapping of, progressive public figures in other West European countries are evidence of a new phase of the USA's "undeclared war" against the peoples of this region with the aim of whipping up hysteria, panic and confusion and, in the long run, of paving the way to power for the most reactionary among the monopoly bourgeoisie. No matter how hard the imperialist secret services try to attribute all these developments to nationalist passions, political strife, and to the mounting anarchism

¹⁸ R. Evans and R. Novak, *The Reagan Revolution*, New York, 1981, p. 199.

¹⁹ *The New York Times*, March 8, 1982.

among the young generation, the origin can be traced to the CIA and its partners. "The US imperialists," writes the Italian magazine *Lotta per la pace*, "have in effect been pursuing a policy of global terror for decades, using for this purpose the CIA and other facilities".¹³

"The future of US intelligence is a crucial policy issue",¹⁴ says R. Cline, former CIA Deputy Director, presently Director of the Centre for Strategic Studies at Georgetown University, and a leading White House adviser on intelligence. He advocates better techniques of secret information collection and analysis and more intensive secret subversion whether the countries concerned want it or not.

The danger of this doctrine is becoming obvious to more and more people throughout the world, including sober-minded Americans. Many former prominent diplomats and even CIA officials, Presidential aides and Federal staffers, some law-makers, scientists, journalists and public figures urge greater control over the CIA and renunciation of the most odious aims and methods of US intelligence. Nevertheless, the US Administration is further stepping up CIA's activities. "Some members of the House and Senate intelligence committees," writes *Newsweek*, "complain that they cannot keep up with the increased level of covert actions and other intelligence operations."

Covert subversive activities accompanied by a "psychological war" are increasingly being resisted by the peace- and freedom-loving nations, governments, parties, social organizations and individuals. As vigilant as ever against the CIA intrigues, champions of peace, democracy, socialism and social progress are far from regarding the intelligence services of the USA and other imperialist states as "invulnerable" and useless to fight against. On the contrary, the past few years indicate that given determination and solidarity, the peace-loving forces can foil the most perfidious designs of the "cloak and dagger" men. Fighting the machinations of imperialist secret services is part and parcel of the struggle for peace, detente, democracy and social progress.

¹³ *Lotta per la pace*, No. 8, 1981.

¹⁴ Rags Cline, *The Future of US Foreign Intelligence Operations in the United States in the 1980s*, Stanford (Calif.), 1980, p. 469.

COPYRIGHT: Obshchestvo "Znaniye", 1982 English Translation Copyright: Progress Publishers 1982

CSO: 2812/42

INTERNATIONAL

WORK OF USSR-FRG FRIENDSHIP SOCIETY PRAISED

PMOS1229 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 2 Dec 82 Morning Edition p 5

[Article by "USSR-FRG Society Chairman L. Zamyatin: "For the Sake of Mutual Understanding"]

[Text] It is 10 years since the "USSR-FRG" Society was formed. It was set up to promote the development and strengthening of mutual understanding, trust, friendship and cultural cooperation between the peoples of the USSR and FRG. In 10 years the society has become a mass public organization. There are primary organizations of the society at industrial enterprises, scientific research institutes and educational establishments in all our country's union republics. Many thousands of people from various walks of life currently participate in the society's activities.

The "USSR-FRG" Society's first steps, like the setting up in the FRG of a whole series of friendship societies, was associated with major positive changes in Europe at the end of the sixties and beginning of the seventies. Lasting significance attaches here to the Moscow treaty signed in the USSR capital on 12 August 1970. The document was the starting point of an important stage in the fundamental normalization of the entire situation in Europe and in the consolidation of detente as a leading trend of international development. It contributed to the appearance of a new atmosphere in relations between the USSR and FRG and helped to develop constructive cooperation based on the principles of peaceful coexistence among states with different social systems.

The vast majority of regional "FRG-USSR" societies owe their birth to the Moscow treaty. There is an active federation of "FRG-USSR" societies which coordinates the activity of 13 regional societies.

What has been the result of joint efforts by the "USSR-FRG" Society and its partners in the FRG?

A great deal has been done. The multifaceted measures conducted by the friendship societies in recent years constitute an impressive list of fine deeds. I will cite as an example the colloquiums of public representatives from the two countries which have been held regularly since 1975. They have been held in Dortmund and Moscow, Cologne and Kiev. The meetings analyzed in detail the state and prospects

of the development of relations between the USSR and the FRG in the light of the Moscow treaty and the final act of the all-European conference in Helsinki. There have been two international colloquiums in Tutzing (FRG) attended by a wide audience.

The "USSR-FRG" Society aktiv has been addressed by well-known FRG politicians and public figures such as Willy Brandt, Annemarie Renger, Erhard Eppler, Walther Kiep and others.

A number of important bilateral meetings and symposiums have been held on problems relating to medicine, environmental conservation, vocational and technical education and other matters.

There are festivals in the FRG and the USSR celebrating the Soviet Union and FRG (word indistinct) and cities respectively.

The USSR and the FRG possess great potential in terms of cultural values and scientific and technical achievements. The societies enable the public in both countries to acquaint themselves with those achievements by organizing various exhibitions. There was the very successful "space exploration and environmental conservation" exhibition in Munich. The "Bavaria—land and people" exhibition in Moscow was an outstanding event. The "USSR—country and people" photographic exhibition has visited Essen, Duisburg, Gelsenkirchen and other FRG cities. The wide-ranging "looking at the FRG" exhibition was seen in Yerevan, Baku, Tashkent, Alma-Ata, Kiev, Tbilisi, Leningrad and Tallinn.

Joint measures are carried out in connection with significant dates in our states' lives. This year a number of events are being held in the FRG in connection with the 60th anniversary of the USSR's formation. For example, there was a successful Soviet trade and industry exhibition in Dueseldorf in October. The "USSR-FRG" Society and its West German partners were involved in organizing and staging it. Much attention is devoted to the development of partnership ties between Soviet and FRG cities.

All this has been and is being done on the basis of the joint declaration signed on 6 May 1978 in Bonn. This document noted, in particular: "It is very important for the idea of better mutual understanding, mutual respect and greater benevolence toward one another to be implanted and to deepen in the consciousness of people of both states. This applies especially to young people, who must never have to go through what previous generations experienced. Both sides are aware that this requires constant, greater and greater, and in particular joint efforts."

What has been done in the last 10 years constitutes jointly accumulated experience which aids progress and the setting and fulfillment of more and more new tasks. The tasks are not getting any easier. On the contrary, in fact, because the international situation has changed, and it has not changed for the better, unfortunately.

Since the first days of Soviet power our state has invariably expressed its readiness for open, honest cooperation with all countries which reciprocate. Different social systems should be no obstacle to this—and there are no obstacles

when there is good will on both sides. "This is convincingly confirmed," Yu. V. Andropov, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, stressed, "by the marked progress made in the development of peaceful cooperation between the USSR and many West European countries." It is our profound belief, he noted, that the seventies, which bore the imprint of detente, were not, as some imperialist figures would have it, a chance episode in mankind's difficult history. No, the policy of detente is by no means a past stage. The future belongs to it.

Everyone is equally interested in preserving peace and detente. We know that in the FRG, too, there are millions of people, including many prominent statesmen and politicians, who sincerely want lasting peace and good cooperation with the Soviet Union, with the GDR and other socialist community countries.

During the recent Moscow meeting between Yu. V. Andropov, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, and V. Carstens, federal president of the FRG, in which A. A. Gromyko and H. D. Genscher participated, both sides confirmed their readiness to further develop mutually advantageous cooperation on the basis of concluded treaties and agreements. This is an important statement indicative of a desire for further cooperation.

One would like to think that the Soviet Union and the FRG will stick to the tested and proven line of preserving what has been achieved and consistently and tirelessly developing cooperation in diverse spheres and the ability to trust in response to trust. A substantial part is played here by the purposeful joint activity of friendship societies. It is their duty to help preserve and improve the mutual understanding that has been achieved and to contribute to good-neighborliness.

CSO: 1807/67

INTERNATIONAL

U.S. CRITICIZED FOR POLICY TOWARD NAMIBIA, OAU

PM150925 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 7 Dec 82 Morning Edition p 5

[Article by political observer K. Geyvandov: "Africa's Troubled Times"]

[Text] For the second time in less than 4 months an attempt to hold the annual assembly of OAU heads of states and governments has been thwarted. In both instances this was done outwardly on procedural questions. The first time Morocco and certain other members of the organization did not like the fact that the Saharan Democratic Arab Republic [SDAR], which, incidentally, has already been recognized by 28 African states, has been admitted to it. They did everything to prevent the necessary quorum of 34 OAU members from being formed for the work of a summit conference. The second time, when the question of the SDAR's membership had been removed from the agenda, a dispute flared up over Chad's representation. It resulted in the same thing—the absence of a quorum, although the heads of state and government of 31 African countries did gather in Tripoli, the Libyan capital.

These are unprecedented facts in the OAU annals, and, basing themselves on them, many observers believe that the organization's very future has been placed in jeopardy. Just such a formulation of the question attests best of all to the fact that behind the purely procedural facade we are dealing with undoubtedly more deep-seated processes of fundamental significance to the life and activity of African states and the destinies of their peoples. It has to be said that from the very first days of its existence the OAU has been like a thorn in the flesh of imperialism. The principles proclaimed by it have hindered the efforts of imperialism, and of American imperialism above all, to slow down in every possible way the process of Africa's decolonization and suppress the national liberation struggle of its peoples, to prevent by any means the independent development of the continent's liberated countries and to impose on them its own neocolonialist conditions and usages.

Therefore, the imperialist powers systematically make attempts if not to pull the OAU apart, then to endeavor to weaken it and bleed it white and to emasculate the entire militant content of this organization's activity. The United States is noted for its particular activeness in this, for it is using the decolonization of Africa in order to take the place of France and Britain there. Washington's

extreme displeasure at the decisions of last year's OAU assembly to hold its next summit meeting in the Libyan capital was a logical consequence of this. First, Libya is a country marching in the front ranks of the anti-imperialist, national liberation struggle and a country which Reagan's White House has proclaimed its deadly enemy. Second, the holding of the highest OAU forum there means that M. al-Qadhafi, leader of the Libyan revolution, will become the organization's chairman for a whole year. Third, and I believe this is the most important point, the United States did not want the leaders of African countries to draw up and approve in Tripoli still more resolute measures to counteract the criminal plans of American imperialism on the continent.

If we analyze the events of just the past few months it is not hard to see that the U.S. administration has more than enough grounds for fears of this sort. Take, for example, the Americans' activity in southern Africa. The situation that has taken shape there is almost identical with the Near East situation. The racists of the Republic of South Africa, who have established a regime of apartheid in the country, are pursuing a policy of inhuman terror and repression against the active opponents of that system. They have unceremoniously occupied Namibia—a UN mandated territory—and, contrary to repeated demands from this organization, including UN Security Council Resolution 435, they refuse to withdraw their troops from there in order to ensure its independence. By means of systematic subversive actions and continuous acts of aggression the South African racists are trying to destabilize the situation in neighboring independent countries—Angola, Zambia, Botswana, Zimbabwe and Mozambique.

These actions by the rulers of the Republic of South Africa have long been resolutely condemned by the world community, with the exception, of course, of the U.S. administration, since the policy being pursued by Pretoria is in direct accord with Washington's global military-strategic plans. Hence the policy proclaimed by the White House of "constructive cooperation" with the Republic of South Africa (in the case of Israel, as we recall, the same thing is called "strategic cooperation"—k.g.). In practice the implementation of this policy boils down, on the one hand, to broadening economic, military and nuclear cooperation with the apartheid regime and, on the other, mounting a campaign to rehabilitate the racists of the Republic of South Africa in the eyes of the world public. And it is possible to judge how zealously the Reagan administration is implementing this policy, in particular, from the fact that under pressure from Washington the IMF recently issued a loan of more than \$1 billion to the government of the Republic of South Africa. For the United States has at its disposal 19-64 percent of the votes in "this rich people's club," as the IMF has aptly been nicknamed by (Pafovora), Nigeria's deputy permanent representative at the United Nations.

Washington displays special zeal in encouraging and supporting the actions of the Republic of South Africa regime in Namibia against neighboring states. Although, for example, with regard to the Namibian problem there exists a UN Security Council resolution which clearly defines ways to resolve it, the U.S. administration has arbitrarily appropriated the role of "intermediary" and is making every effort to "settle" it to its own advantage and that of its "constructive ally." And in order to cover up such activity with the "figleaf" of collectivity the United States has succeeded in involving a number of Western states in it.

U.S. policy in southern Africa manifested itself with the greatest openness and cynicism during U.S. Vice President Bush's November tour of seven countries on the continent. During the talks in African capitals Bush assured his interlocutors that, seeking to resolve the question of Namibia's independence, the American administration can put pressure on the authorities in the Republic of South Africa and induce them to withdraw their troops from Namibia. But.... What "buts" can there be here? For UN Security Council Resolution 435 plainly speaks of the need to withdraw the occupation troops of the Republic of South Africa. But no! Such a formulation of the question does not suit the White House. It "insists" that simultaneously with the departure of the South African racists' units and subunits from Namibia...the contingent of Cuban troops which is in Angola at the request of its legitimate government be withdrawn from that country.

This sort of "linkage" in turn irritated and angered Bush's African interlocutors. Regardless of their political convictions, they declared with one voice that the question of the Cuban troops' presence in Angola is a sovereign matter for the Angolan Government and has nothing to do with Namibia's gaining independence.

Nonetheless, after his tour Vice President Bush once again declared that the United States will continue to advocate "linking" the granting of Namibian independence with the withdrawal of Cuban troops from Angola, despite the opposition from Africa. What is the reason for such obstinacy? The answer to this question is provided by the CHRISTIAN SCIENCE MONITOR. "The Reagan administration," it writes, "is trying to gain time.... Although it is not so publicly, it nourishes the hope that under pressure from economic difficulties (which, incidentally, are largely being artificially created by the United States and its allies--K.G.) Angola's 'Marxist' government will either agree to send the Cuban troops home or will be overthrown by J. Savimbi's rebel organization, the National Union for the Total Independence of Angola."

You will agree that such U.S. actions and plans can only be called criminal. It was evidently the fear that they would be exposed with new force at the OAU's annual, 19th supreme forum that prompted Washington to take actions which, so Western news agencies maintain, largely prevented the holding of the assembly. But, to judge from the way in which events have developed, the United States has only partly succeeded in achieving its aims. The leaders of the 31 African states who met in Tripoli adopted a joint statement exposing and resolutely condemning the Reagan administration's cooperation with the racists of the Republic of South Africa and the Americans' other intrigues on the continent and pointing out that U.S. policy is contrary to the interests both of the peoples of Africa and of all mankind.

The leaders of these African countries advocated all possible support for the armed independence struggle of the Namibian people headed by SWAPO and the oppressed South African majority's struggle against the apartheid regime. They also proclaimed that they intend to continue efforts to convene somewhat later the OAU assembly not held now, creating a special committee to prepare its work....

In 1963 my destiny as a journalist led me to work in Africa. To this day I remember 25 May that year, when the world witnessed the birth of the OAU. The young organization of young independent Africa set itself the noble task of joining forces in the struggle for the final decolonization of the continent and achieving a situation in which the political independence of the states belonging to it would be supplemented by economic independence so that the African peoples could advance steadily along the path of social progress, a considerable amount has been done since then. This is evidenced if only by the fact that the number of OAU members has risen from 30 then to 51 now. And obviously there can be no doubt that the healthy forces in the organization will find the means and possibilities for ensuring that they greet their 20th anniversary united and cohesive. In the final analysis this [is] the guarantee of the successful implementation of the great tasks facing the OAU.

CSO: 1807/64

INTERNATIONAL

MAURITIAN LEADERS INTERVIEWED ON SOCIOECONOMIC, FOREIGN POLICIES

Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 9 Dec 82 p 5

[IZVESTIYA correspondent B. Pilyatskin letter from Mauritius: "Problems of the Sunny Isle"]

[Excerpt] Port Louis--The single-crop agriculture concealed by the striking metaphor--"sugar pearl"--which was planted for many decades by the former colonial bosses, is proving for the tiny island state to be the bitter taste of urgent economic problems. These problems are made worse by the extremely grave legacy following the Labor Party's 14 years of continuous rule. At the last elections in June 1982 the vast majority of the electorate essentially expressed by its vote a lack of confidence in its entire policy. A government of forces of the left took office which proclaimed a program of social and economic transformations in the interests of the broad working people's masses. Of the 60 seats in parliament, the Mauritius Militant Movement (MMM) has 42 and its ally in the coalition government--the Mauritian Socialist Party (MSP)--18.

What has changed in the life of the country in the last few months? I began my conversation with this subject with Mauritian Prime Minister Aneerood Jugnauth, who kindly agreed to receive the IZVESTIYA correspondent.

"A priority task in the political sphere," he said, "is to consolidate the democratic institutions and strengthen the people's spirit of patriotism and unity. We have made the necessary changes to the constitution to provide for mandatory parliamentary elections every 5 years. I draw attention to this because the previous government failed to observe the specified time limit and manipulated it as it wished.

"Mauritius is a multiracial country, and all communities must be afforded equal opportunities for development of the national culture. In all past years only lipservice was paid to this. A local administration commission has now been set up which is studying proposals on decentralization of state administration for the purpose of granting the municipalities greater independence and initiative. Another commission is studying the problem of education. The lack of planning in this question has led to the point where we have a surplus of young people with degrees in the humanities--so-called 'white-collar workers'. Yet the country needs agronomists, engineers and so forth."

Touching on economic tasks, the prime minister made of paramount importance the need for the accumulation of resources for the financing of development projects and combating unemployment. Both these questions are directly linked with the present and future of the country and, naturally, they are at the epicenter of public debate and newspaper polemics.

Explaining these measures and also the impending introduction of a 5-percent tax on the sale of certain consumer goods, Paul Berenger, minister of finance and economics, a leader of the MSM Party, declared that the government sees no other reasonable way out of the crisis situation. The point being that the Laborites, who signed agreements on big loans with the IMF and the IBRD, had brought the country to a standstill. In the past 2 years its economic development has practically come to a halt. The balance of payments deficit has reached an astronomical figure, exceeding 1.5 billion rupees. The number of unemployed stands at approximately 90,000 (roughly one-third of Mauritius' work force).

Mauritius is still only at the start of the implementation of all these plans, but rightwing circles closely connected with the West and endeavoring by any means to maintain the status quo, have already conducted an open attack on the government. Gaston Duval, leader of the social democrats, who is well known for his pro-imperialist orientation and proximity to the racist South African regime, and his sympathizers are coming out with demagogic attacks on the coalition of forces of the left and discrediting Mauritius' progressive foreign policy, in which in recent months it has been possible to observe such positive features as recognition of the PLO and POLISARIO Government, which has proclaimed an independent state in Western Sahara, and statements in support of the just struggle of South Africa's ANC and the sole legitimate representative of the Namibian people--SWAPO.

To the government's credit also is the fact that Mauritius' demands for the return of the illegally seized Chagos Archipelago have acquired new impetus and concrete content. In accordance with a law passed by the Legislative Assembly, Chagos, which includes the Diego Garcia atoll, has been proclaimed an inalienable part of Mauritian territory, and food supplies from Mauritius for the servicemen of the American base have been banned. The task of a special commission created by parliament includes an investigation of all the circumstances of Britain's seizure of Chagos and arbitrary "leasing" of Diego Garcia to the United States for 50 years.

"We are particularly disturbed by the deployment of nuclear weapons there," Prime Minister A. Jugnauth told me. "We advocate no foreign bases in the Indian Ocean. Let it be open only for peaceful purposes."

Touching on relations with the Soviet Union, the head of government observed that they are very good and that Mauritius aspires to their further expansion and strengthening. We know, he continued, that the Soviet Union supports the developing countries, and I personally see a broad field for our mutual cooperation, particularly in the sphere of trade, the development of ocean resources and personnel training.

INTERNATIONAL

MADRID MEETING URGED TO CALL CONFERENCE ON CONFIDENCE-BUILDING MEASURES

PM221425 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 15 Dec 82 second edition p 3

[Article by F. Konstantinov: "Confidence Building: What the Peoples Expect from the Madrid Meeting"]

[Text] The Madrid meeting of representatives of the states which took part in the conference on security and cooperation in Europe is continuing its work. The range of questions discussed at it is broad. They concern various aspects of the European countries' life. The peoples pin their hopes for the improvement of the international situation, the clearing of the political horizons and the consolidation of confidence in the future of the cause of detente on the successful completion of the meeting.

The meeting in Madrid is taking place at a difficult and anxious time. The late 20th century "crusaders" have declared a campaign against the socialist countries, and they are by no means armed with the knights' lances of olden days. They have created enormous arsenals of mass destruction weapons. Deliberately heating the atmosphere and counting on achieving military superiority and dealing a first nuclear strike, they would like to secure themselves the right to dictate conditions to other states.

The overtly aggressive strategy of "direct confrontation" with the USSR and the other socialist community countries is not only basically absurd but also extremely dangerous. This is becoming increasingly obvious. And the growth of the antiwar, antinuclear movement in both Europe and the United States is no accident under the prevailing conditions.

In this exceptionally acute atmosphere any step, even a small one, aimed at normalizing this atmosphere, is welcomed as a hope for a change for the better in the trend in the development of events. In that sense the Madrid meeting has a special place.

Of the wide range of problems which are being examined at the meeting we cannot fail to single out the key question—the question of strengthening the security of the European peoples. Its discussion can and should lead to the decision to convene a conference on confidence building measures and security and disarmament in Europe. The significance of this decision, if it is taken, would be hard to overestimate.

The question of convening such a conference is placed at the center of the Madrid meeting by the very logic of life. The decision to convene it, the communique of the Warsaw Pact Foreign Ministers Committee session held in late October says, "would be a substantial contribution to the development of detente and the consolidation of security in Europe."

It is well known that the Soviet Union and the other socialist community countries are associated with the idea of convening the conference. Its support by the absolute majority of European states had led to the point where the participants in the Madrid meeting now have a draft mandate for the conference based on a consideration of the sides' position and creating the necessary conditions for the question's definitive solution.

Aware that definite efforts will be required on the part of all participants in the meeting to take the decision to convene the conference, the Soviet Union for its part has already taken great and exceptionally important steps in the direction of a compromise and a search for mutually acceptable accords, including on the most complex question—the region of application of future confidence-building measures.

Since the Helsinki Final Act was signed the states which took part in the all-European conference have implemented the confidence-building measures envisaged by that document. They include notification of large-scale exercises, the invitation of observers to military exercises, and mutual exchange by invitation of military personnel. As a whole the confidence-building measures envisaged have been implemented and produced a positive result. Definite experience has already been accumulated in this field.

The present complication in the international situation increases still further the importance of confidence-building measures. Their development and intensification and the expansion of their sphere of influence would make it possible to move to a new stage in the normalization of the political atmosphere in Europe and the strengthening of security on the continent.

The continuation of the policy of detente, to which the future belongs—that is the Soviet Union's unvarying stance. It acquired authoritative new confirmation at the CPSU Central Committee November Plenum.

In steering a consistent line toward confidence-building the Soviet Union has advocated expanding these measures. In particular it has suggested extending them to large-scale troop movements, large-scale naval and air force exercises in the sea and air expanses adjacent to Europe, and giving notification of these exercises further in advance and from a level not of 25,000 but of 20,000 men.

The Soviet proposal to limit the level of military exercises to the participation of no more than 40,000–50,000 men is also very important. Obviously it is worth giving a special description of the importance of this measure. It is aimed at strengthening security and is subordinated to the idea of consolidating the stability of the situation. In actual fact, the holding of gigantic military exercises, for instance the NATO autumn forge exercises, in which 200,000–300,000 servicemen, thousands of tanks and combat aircraft and

other military equipment and the entire NATO administration system are involved cannot fail to cause anxiety, particularly in the Warsaw Pact states and neutral nonaligned countries adjacent to the regions in which they are held.

The socialist countries' position with regard to the region in which military activity should be encompassed by the future confidence-building steps is well known. It is that this region should include the continental and island part of Europe and adjacent sea (ocean) and air expanses.

Great significance for the quest for a mutually acceptable solution on the question of confidence, which directly affects the interests of the security of all states which took part in the all-European conference, attaches to the Soviet Union's readiness to extend confidence-building measures to the entire European part of its territory. Naturally, the Soviet Union's readiness presupposes that other states, primarily the NATO countries, will for their part set about ensuring that confidence-building measures also encompass the activity, including the autonomous activity, of naval and air forces in the sea (ocean) and airspace adjacent to Europe. This approach is justified by the military-political and strategic situation which actually exists in Europe. After all, it is well known, for instance, that the NATO bloc's military preparations do not begin at the edge of the shores of continental Europe.

It is clear from Western press comments that so far the United States and some of its allies are not prepared to embark on this. They try to conceal their position with various far-fetched pretexts, seeking to secure one-sided military advantages and keep their hands free to implement various troop movements, to carry out autonomous activity on the part of naval and air forces and to pursue the notorious "gunboat policy." It is these pretexts that matter, and not considerations that encompassing military activity in the sea (ocean) expanses adjacent to Europe with confidence-building measures will allegedly harm freedom of navigation. On the contrary, this will promote freedom and security of navigation in sea and ocean waters.

The Madrid meeting is continuing. And there are grounds for asserting that objectively every condition exists for its successful completion and for the adoption of an important, balanced final document envisaging the convening of a conference on confidence-building measures and security and disarmament in Europe. To fail to use these opportunities would be a blow to the peoples' hopes.

CSO: 1807/76

INTERNATIONAL

PAPERS MARK YUGOSLAV NATIONAL HOLIDAY

'PRAVDA' Comment

PH091651 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 28 Nov 82 Second edition p 4

[Own correspondent V. Sharov report under the rubric "29 November Is the SFRY's National Holiday—Republic Day"; Revolving Urgent Tasks"]

[Excerpt] The attention of communists and all working people in the SFRY is centered on the implementation of the decisions of the 12th LCY Congress, held this year, which summed up the results of the creative activity of the party and people, revealed the reasons for the economic difficulties which the country has encountered in recent years and outlined ways of accelerating Yugoslavia's socioeconomic development. The League of Communists, adopting measures to strengthen its vanguard role in society, is mobilizing the masses to overcome the difficulties and resolve urgent problems. Among these problems is that of ensuring dynamic economic development and fuller employment for the population, increasing labor productivity and stepping up the struggle against inflation and rising prices. Among the acute issues which life has put on the agenda are those of increasing exports, eliminating the deficit in trade with the West, eliminating dependence on deliveries of raw materials and other materials from capitalist countries and evening out the levels of development of the individual republics and regions. The implementation of the long-term economic stabilization program, as the 12th Congress documents show, is the main task for the LCY and all the people.

The congress and subsequent LCY Central Committee Plenums noted the special responsibility of the LCY as the leading ideological and political force in society for the steady development of the national economy in the conditions of socialist building.

Substantial significance for the country's progress is attached to improving its foreign economic ties and involving the SFRY's national economy actively and rationally in the international division of labor. A stabilizing factor for Yugoslavia has been its economic cooperation with the USSR and the other CEMA countries, which is developing on the basis of the principles of equality and mutual advantage. The main guidelines for collaboration between the Soviet Union and the SFRY are outlined in the long-term program for economic, scientific and technical cooperation for 1981-1990. This document plays an important part in ensuring the stability and effectiveness of our relations.

The USSR is the SFRY's biggest trade partner. The volume of reciprocal trade turnover is constantly growing. It is planned that in the current 5-year plan it will reach about \$32 billion, as against \$18 billion in 1976-1980. In reciprocal deliveries, alongside raw materials and consumer goods, an increasingly large place is occupied by machines and equipment, including those produced within the framework of specialization and production sharing. On the basis of a special agreement concluded between CEMA and Yugoslavia, the country takes part in the work of nearly all the CEMA commissions and in the implementation of a number of measures under the comprehensive program. This undoubtedly enriches our cooperation and opens up new prospects for it.

The USSR's economic and technical assistance in the erection and modernization of various projects on SFRY territory is extensive. The fruits of its collaboration include power stations and enterprises in ferrous and nonferrous metallurgy and other sectors--there are more than 80 of them. On the eve of the holiday such projects as Bitola and Pljevlja, the coke-oven battery at the Zenica Mining and Metallurgical Combine and the first phase of the lead and zinc mine at Vares began their operating lives.

The Soviet Union also receives considerable benefit from this equitable economic cooperation. Our country receives from Yugoslavia ships, equipment for nuclear power stations and metallurgical plants, metal-cutting machine tools, subassemblies for motor vehicles, alumina, lead, zinc, antimony and other output. We receive large consignments of Yugoslav leather footwear, knitwear, woolen textiles and other consumer goods.

Friendly Soviet-Yugoslav relations accord with the vital interests of the peoples of the USSR and the SFRY. The leaders of our parties and states have repeatedly declared their mutual readiness to further develop and deepen these relations. The CPSU Central Committee and the Soviet Government consistently pursue the course reaffirmed by the 26th Party Congress of extending equitable, all-around cooperation between the USSR and the SFRY and between the CPSU and the LCY. A good basis exists for its fruitful implementation. This basis is the deep roots of our friendship, tempered in the flames of the struggle against fascism. It is the many years of experience of our cooperation in various spheres, and the well-known tried and tested principles and accords contained in the joint documents.

'KRASNAYA ZVEZDA' Comment

PM091605 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 28 Nov 82 second edition p 3

[Unattributed article: "Yugoslav Working People's Holiday"]

[Text] The date 29 November 1943 is inscribed on the national emblem of the SFRY. It was on that day, 39 years ago, that the second session of the Antifascist Council of National Liberation of Yugoslavia (AVNOJ) opened in the ancient Bosnian city of Jajce on territory liberated from the fascist invaders. The session set forth the foundations of the new Yugoslavia and formed the National Liberation Committee, which became the first people's government. It was headed by Comrade J. Broz Tito. Addressing the session's participants at the end of its work, he said: "Goodbye, comrade deputies, until the third AVNOJ session in liberated Belgrade!"

These words, filled with optimism and faith in victory, were realized. Soviet and Yugoslav troops successfully completed the Belgrade operation in October 1944 and purged the Yugoslav capital of Hitler's invaders. Assessing the contribution made by the Soviet Union and its armed forces to the enemy's defeat, J. B. Tito stressed that they had "borne the main brunt of the war and played the decisive part in the victory over the dark forces of fascism. We will never forget the many thousands of Soviet heroes who, during this struggle and on the battlefields in Yugoslavia alongside our own servicemen, shed their blood and sacrificed their lives."

The blood shed by those heroes did not flow in vain. It nurtured the friendly shoots of the new life sprouting on Yugoslavia's ancient land. Exactly 2 years after the second AVNOJ session, on the same day, 29 November, in 1945, Yugoslavia was proclaimed a people's republic. Since then this day has been marked as the national holiday--Republic Day.

Having accomplished a socialist revolution under the Communist Party's leadership, the Yugoslav working people achieved major successes in the political, economic and cultural development of their motherland. In a historically brief period the formerly backward country was transformed into a developed industrial-agrarian state.

The SFRY constitution points out that Yugoslavia builds its relations with other states on the basis of the principles of respect for national sovereignty and equal rights, noninterference in other countries' internal affairs and the solution of international disputes by peaceful means. Yugoslavia is one of the founders, and an active member, of the Nonaligned Movement.

The SFRY working people and peoples rightly link all their successes in building a new life with the LCY's activity. The 12th LCY Congress in June 1982 noted that in the past 4 years, thanks to the LCY's activity and the efforts of the working people, Yugoslavia has achieved marked results in socioeconomic development. The country's national economic potential has strengthened. Dozens of large-scale projects have been commissioned, in particular in metallurgy, energy and the aluminum industry. Health care and public education have been improved and the social security system has been developed.

Soviet-Yugoslav relations are developing fruitfully. They are based firmly on complete mutual respect for the principles contained in the 1955 Belgrade declaration and subsequent documents adopted at summit level. Economic, scientific and technical cooperation between the USSR and the SFRY has acquired broad scope. It continues to gather momentum. This is facilitated by its equitable and mutually advantageous nature. In the past 5-year period Soviet-Yugoslav trade turnover has increased 150 percent by comparison with the previous 5-year plan.

Congratulating their Yugoslav friends today, Soviet people and the servicemen of the Soviet Armed Forces wish them new achievements in socialist building and the consolidation of their motherland's defense capability and express the firm confidence that our peoples' traditional friendship will continue to strengthen and develop.

CSO: 1807/75

INTERNATIONAL

GLOOMY OUTLOOK SEEN FOR FRG FREE DEMOCRATS

PMO91645 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 6 Dec 82 Second Edition p 5

[Own correspondent Yu. Yakhontov report under the rubric "Echo of the Week": "The FRG: Delimitation, Disputes"]

[Text] Bonn, 5 Dec--Two new organizations have appeared in the FRG political arena--the "Liberal Democrats" (LD) and the "Democratic Socialists" (DS). The "Young Democrats" organization has also split decisively from its "parent" party--the Free Democratic Party (FDP).

These changes have directly affected two old parties--the FDP and the Social Democratic Party of Germany [SPD]--which were for 13 years partners in the government coalition which ceased to exist in September of this year.

The stormy, irreversible processes in the Free Democrats' ranks were caused by the "big change" which certain FDP leaders had talked about for a long time and which they finally carried out--the break with the SPD and the move into the camp of the Christian Democratic Union and the Christian Social Union [CDU/CSU]. This was followed by the formation of a bourgeois-liberal coalition. Many FDP members did not like either the entry into a coalition with the bloc of rightwing parties or the very fact of the party's shifting from one camp to another. The change of partner, or, as many people here think, the betrayal of a partner is regarded as a violation of the mandate given by the voters, many of whom voted for the FDP in the 1980 elections only because it declared its intention of cooperating with the Social Democrats. The reaction to the step taken in September has now occurred.

Disappointment, dissatisfaction and even undisguised indignation at the FDP leadership's "big change" led to many well-known figures leaving its ranks--such as, for instance, the oldest party member, W. Born, general secretary G. Verheugen, Bundestag deputies I. Matthaeus-Maier, H. Schuchardt and F. Hoelscher and others. The process of leaving the party continues.

Some of those leaving the FDP have gone over to the Social Democrats. Others decided to seek to revive the trampled "political liberalism." On the last Sunday in November a Ruhr industrial center, the city of Bochum, was the scene of a

congress of so-called "liberal associations" in which around 1,500 people took part. In essence the congress became the founding congress of a new Liberal Democratic Party split off from the FDP. U. Krueger, a former deputy of the Hessian Landtag, became head of the organization, while the 80-year-old W. Born was elected honorary chairman.

As yet the party has neither a precise political program nor a charter. The question of whether it will take part in the election struggle and seek Bundestag seats if the March elections promised by the present government take place has not been decided. The LD leadership intends to resolve these questions in January, when a party congress will be convened. In the newspapers' opinion as yet the party has little chance of succeeding in gaining even the minimum 5 percent of votes necessary to enter the Bundestag. But the prevailing mood among LD members is militant, and there is a readiness to participate actively in political life and strengthen and extend the organization.

The youth organization from which the party has drawn its recruits over more than 13 years has also left the FDP. True, this was not an "unexpected blow." Back in 1969, as the newspaper *GENERAL-ANZEIGER* recalls, the "Young Democrats" warned that, if the FDP broke the alliance with the Social Democrats, they would sever all ties with their "senior partners." That is what happened at an extraordinary "Young Democrats" congress, also held in Bochum simultaneously with the LD congress. W. Lutz, chairman of the youth organization, stated frankly in his speech that its decision was taken because the FDP leadership had broken the promise given to voters concerning the coalition with the SPD.

In the light of all this it is clear that the FDP's position has now become extremely complex. The breaking of the Social-Liberal coalition, the move into the CDU/CSU camp, the departure from the party of influential members and members with prestige--none of this will help increase the numbers voting for the Free Democrats. The results of the recent land elections in Hesse and Bavaria provided convincing evidence: the FDP lost its seats in both Landtags. All this, as well-informed local observers believe, does not increase the FDP's already reduced chances of passing the 5-percent barrier in the event of early parliamentary elections.

There have also been changes in circles close to the SPD. Not very long ago two well-known SPD figures, Bundestag deputies M. Coppel and K. H. Hansen, left the party and became "independent parliamentarians." The reason for this step was their disagreement with the adherence of certain influential West German Social Democrat figures to the notorious NATO "dual" (read "missile") decision and the negative attitude of the party leadership to the growing ecological movement in the country.

The Democratic Socialists who have united around Coppel and Hansen announced at their conference, held in the city of Muenster, the creation of a party to act as an "anticapitalist" and "socialist" alternative to the parties represented in parliament. The press regards the Democratic Socialists as a social grouping to the left of the SPD and uniting those who do not agree with the former policy of leading circles of the Bonn Social Democrats.

The Democratic Socialists also have no precise program or charter as yet. The document which they provisionally adopted in Muenster is highly contradictory and debatable in many respects. They have not yet decided whether to take part in possible early Bundestag elections. In their view there is too little time left to prepare. Nonetheless a decision was taken not to support the "greens" in the elections.

So what is happening in the FRG's political life now--the split and delimitation in the FDP and the SPD, the creation of new parties, debates over the future course which the country should follow, not least in connection with the NATO "upgrading" decision--is convincing evidence that the FRG population is reluctant to follow unthinkingly in Washington's dangerous wake.

In effect the election campaign here has already begun, although the elections promised by H. Kohl's government have not yet been officially announced and hardly anyone is firmly confident that they will take place. And this campaign, as last week's events show, promises to be keen and tense.

CSO: 1807/71

INTERNATIONAL

UZBEK ACADEMICIAN REFUTES WESTERN DISTORTIONS

LD231636 Moscow TASS in English 0740 GMT 23 Dec 82

["'Linguists'—Radio Saboteurs"—TASS headline]

[Text:] Tashkent, 22 Dec, TASS—TASS correspondent Robert Serebrennikov reports:

"'Sovietologists' from the subversive 'Liberty' Radio station grossly distort my article, facts and history," said corresponding member of the Academy of Sciences of Soviet Uzbekistan, poet Uigun [spelling of name as received]. "Some Opinions on Contemporary Uzbek Orthography" was published in the October journal SHARK YULDUZI (THE STAR OF THE EAST). The "Liberty" subversive radio station which is in the upkeep of the CIA and which operates from Munich concocted in connection with this article a number of anti-Soviet broadcasts to Farsi-speaking countries, specifically to Soviet Central Asia.

"Linguists" from Munich came out with a lot of nonsense, Uigun said. They made hackneyed allegations about "Russification" of Soviet national republics, resorted to unjustified assertions about "forcible introduction" of Russian words in the Uzbek language after the October Revolution. Everything has been turned topsy turvy. "Linguistic exercises" of the "Liberty" station have one aim, to denigrate the Russian language, to try to discredit its outstanding significance in the history of the development of the Uzbek language, of the Uzbek culture, national in form and socialist in content. These are futile attempts.

The October Socialist Revolution implemented under the leadership of immortal Lenin, the formation of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics opened new historic horizons to the Uzbek people, enabled it to make a transition within a short historic period from feudalism to socialism, bypassing a painful stage of capitalism, to score great achievements in the development of the national economy, science and culture, Uigun stressed. It is only two per cent of the Uzbek people that knew how to read and write prior to the revolution; the masses of the people languished in poverty and ignorance. There was not a single higher educational establishment in Central Asia. There were only several dozens of schools mainly for children of well-off parents.

The socialist transformations, the cultural revolution that liquidated the age-old backwardness opened the unprecedented scope for the versatile creative forces of free nations of the Soviet East, Uigun said. The national artistic intelligentsia, a constellation of talented writer, artists, composers, architects and actors developed. These outstanding successes are due to the entire Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, above all our elder brother, the Russian people, and the Uzbek people is grateful to it, Uigun said.

Historically the Russian language has become a common language of international communication, of cooperation of all peoples of the USSR, a factor of their access to the wealth of world civilisation, the poet said. The overwhelming majority of the population of Uzbekistan regard the Russian language as the second language and have a fluent command of it.

Touching upon the transition of the Uzbek written language to the Cyrillic alphabet, he pointed out that this promoted the speeding up of the progress of socialist culture of the Uzbek people. Life proved the correctness and wisdom of the free choice we have made.

We treasure the native Uzbek language, Uigun stressed. The richness of the language is an asset for the people and it is the task of scientists to continue developing the Uzbek language, its orthography.

Thanks to the great Russian language the Uzbek language developed and enriched considerably. Its word stock was supplemented remarkably, reflecting the historic changes in the socio-political, socio-economic and cultural life of our republic, the poet said.

Thus, the defining dictionary of the Uzbek language compiled for the first time by the Institute of Language and Literature of the Academy of Sciences of Uzbekistan gives the definition of about 60 thousand words, many of which did not exist in the Uzbek language before. A number of new terms included in the dictionary are borrowings from Russian. They include the Russian words "Sputnik" and "Soviets", "Leninism" and "Bolshevik", "kolkhoz" and other words that are known to the whole world.

The successful solution of the national problem in the USSR has resulted in the all-round development of the languages of all Soviet nations and peoples. Suffice it to recall, Uigun said in conclusion, that in the Soviet period over 40 peoples that had no written language of their own under tsarism acquired in Soviet times thanks to the October Revolution the scientifically developed written language and now have developed national languages.

CSO: 1812/57

INTERNATIONAL

BRIEFS

CSSR FEDERAL ASSEMBLY AIDE—On 25 November V. P. Ruben, chairman of the Soviet of Nationalities of the USSR Supreme Soviet received D. Hanes, deputy chairman of the CSSR Federal Assembly and chairman of the Assembly's Chamber of Nations. A friendly talk took place. [Text] [PM081441 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 26 Nov 82 Morning Edition p 8]

HUNGARIAN OFFICIAL VISITS—On 13 December Z. N. Nuriyev, deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, received J. Marjai, deputy chairman of the Hungarian Council of Ministers, at the latter's request and had a conversation with him on questions of cooperation between the USSR and Hungary in the sphere of agriculture. That same day a conversation was held between deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers I. I. Bodyul and J. Marjai during which questions of cooperation in the sphere of consumer goods production and trade were discussed. [Text] [PM161601 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 14 Dec 82 Second Edition p 4]

USSR-ROMANIAN TRADE MINISTERS—Talks took place 6 December between N. S. Patolichev, USSR minister of foreign trade, and V. Pungan, Romanian minister of foreign trade and international economic cooperation. There was a discussion of questions of the further development of Soviet-Romanian trade and economic relations. [Text] [PM101123 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 7 Dec 82 Second Edition p 4]

NORWEGIAN JOURNALISTS IN UZBEKISTAN—A group of Norwegian journalists headed by Hans (Olegdeg), the chairman of Norway's Journalists Association, departed Uzbekistan on 12 December. During their 2-day stay in Uzbekistan, the guests acquainted themselves with interesting sites in Tashkent and Samarkand, conferred with their Uzbek counterparts and visited the exhibition of Uzbek national products. The guests from Norway also attended a concert by proficient Karakalpak musicians organized on the occasion of Karakalpak cultural days in Uzbekistan dedicated to the 60th anniversary of the Soviet Union. Asked by a Tashkent Radio correspondent to express his views on (what he observed) in Uzbekistan, Hans (Olegdeg) said: The concert by the populist musicians in the Uzbek Opera and Theater House will remain in our memory for a long time. The [words indistinct], music and dancing and the high-quality performance skill of the participating artists have inspired us with [words indistinct]. [Text] [GF131526 Tashkent International Service in Uzbek 1700 GMT 12 Dec 82]

NATIONAL

UNREGULATED BRIGADES, FARM LEADERS EXPERIENCE DIFFICULT RELATIONS

Moscow ZHURNALIST in Russian No 10, Oct 82 pp 31-32

[Article by Yuriy Mikhaylov: "Team Contracting: A Village Variant"]

[Text] In leafing through the pages of newspapers which were published on the eve of the spring harvest work and at the height of the field work you frequently encounter the rubric "The Farmer's Pre-Sowing Lecture Agency." Under it are such voluminous articles as "Seed Dressing—A Mandatory Job," "Barley: Sowing Dates and Seed Depth," and so forth.

The purpose of these materials is at first glance most praiseworthy—to teach the farmer the basic demands of agrotechnics. Many agricultural reviews have the same purpose. One of them emphasizes in heavy italics: "Control over the quality of field operations must not be weakened. Especial attention has to be directed toward the speed of the machinery, and the depth at which seeds are planted. All of the sowing operations have to be conducted in a flow, with no gap permitted between pre-sowing cultivation, sowing, and soil packing. When there is dry windy weather the most important thing is to save soil moisture."

To whom are these instructions addressed? Agronomists and farm leaders? I fear that after becoming acquainted with the review agricultural production specialists, in their turn, might advise journalists to write from left to right, not to mix up lines in a newspaper column, and not to strain cliches.

How and when to sow—as a rule, even beginning mechanization specialists are excellently informed about this. Ineffective work does not at all occur because of a lack of knowledge of the principles of agrotechnics, but because of an inability to organize work, because of imperfections in the management system, and because of the shifting of responsibility from final work results to intermediate ones. Team contracting is one of the concrete forms of organizational work which makes it possible to unite the interests of mechanization specialists with the interests of the farm and of society, and to increase performance discipline.

At one time quite a bit of praise was given to the roster-free links and teams which raised grain and feed on the basis of job contracts plus bonuses. The labor productivity of these "frees" is, as a rule, 1.5 times higher than that of mechanization specialists in the ordinary subdivisions, and their output costs are lower. This is a normal consequence of the mutual exactingness and

mutual help which characterizes collectives that are united by a common responsibility for final work results. It is impossible to work slovenly here: the collective either shoves out the unzealous, or reeducates them.

Despite its undisputed enormous advantages, and despite the fact that team contracting requires neither additional equipment nor any kind of material expenditures, it is spreading very slowly in Kurgan Oblast. Here is how things stand in my Sobkorovskaya Zone. In Shumikhinskiy Rayon there are two such subdivisions, in Satakulevskiy—one, and in Shchuchanskiy—not a single one. There are no more of them in other rayons, and only in Al'menevskiy Rayon has around 30 percent of the production of grain and feed been put on this roster-free basis. And here is a paradox: a rayon which has the worst land in the oblast, land which is evaluated at only 59 points, is one of the first for yields.

While we concentrate attention on propagandizing advanced production experience, and criticize agricultural production leaders and specialists for the poor quality of field work, we are very timid about touching upon the problems of the organization of labor; we rarely write about roster-free links, apparently, because there are few of them. On the other hand, is it not because we write about them so rarely that there are so few of them? Rarely, and on an information level, basically stating their high economic production indicators, but not analyzing the contradictions both within the links and between them and the structure of the farm's management as a whole. A roster-free subdivision has been created—a report will without fail appear on it at least in the rayon newspaper, and its first successful steps will be reported. When it falls apart (which happens quite often), as if attacked by some kind of mysterious ailment—we keep silent.

Speaking at the 17th Congress of Trade Unions, L. I. Brezhnev said that new forms of labor organization and stimulation have to be given the widest dissemination during the current 5-year plan, and, at the same time, he pointed out the reasons hindering the establishment of team contracting: they are shortcomings in production organization and conservative thinking.

The idea of collective responsibility for final work results has also found an extensive reflection in the Food Program which was approved by the May (1982) Plenum of the CPSU Central Committee. Its decisions oblige us, journalists who write on agrarian topics, to delve more deeply into the problems of labor organization, to actively help in overcoming conservative thinking in the approach to the roster-free organization of the production of grain and feed, and not to limit ourselves to just propagandizing it.

In our day it is rare that anyone would directly oppose team contracting. On the contrary, everybody praises it and regrets that it is having great difficulty taking root in agriculture. And that is why frequently the profound conclusion is drawn to the effect that the conditions for roster-free teams and links have allegedly not ripened. Conditions not ripened? That means people have not ripened. But who: the leaders or the mechanization specialists?

Once on the "Zapadnyy" sovkhos in Safakulevskiy Rayon I was preparing an article for the newspaper by the Link Leader A. Kulakhmetov. For more than 10 years Amangel'dy Salim'yanovich has been leading a roster-free link, and year after year his subdivision has been achieving economic production indicators which are considerably higher than the sovkhos average. In 1981, for example, 1,184 quintals of output were produced per sovkhos mechanization specialist engaged in the raising of grain, while in Kulakhmetov's link the figure was 1,887 quintals. Moreover, the cost of a quintal of grain in the sovkhos is 9.14 rubles, and in the link—5.59 rubles. In addition, during the field season the "roster-frees" spent as much as 30 percent of their working time for the performance of jobs not stipulated by the production chart worked out for them; that is, they helped other subdivisions.

It would seem that the sovkhos leadership ought to have done everything possible to cover the largest number of mechanization specialists with team contracting. A few years ago this kind of attempt was made, and two additional links appeared on the farm. At first they gave a very good account of themselves, but soon, without apparent reason, they gave up the ghost. Since that time no one on the sovkhos has lifted a finger to expand the roster-free system, or even to attempt to understand why the links proved to be unsuited for life.

Indeed, why? When you get a detailed acquaintance with the farm's management system you cannot help coming to the conclusion that it is not the disintegration of the two links that is strange, but the fact that the third one has survived.

In his newspaper correspondence Amangel'dy Salim'yanovich related that once the sovkhos Division Manager N. Zyblov, to whom the link was directly subordinate, threw out in anger: "Anyhow, I will break up your link." Perhaps it was an accident that these words tore from his lips, but somehow the manager almost did achieve what he wanted: the link leader arrives at his place of work, but nobody is there. It turns out, that without his knowledge, the manager had sent the mechanization specialists to other jobs. Keeping the link together after this kind of unceremonious intervention was just touch-and-go. Similar conflicts follow one after another.

"I do not so much lead the link as argue with the manager," Kulakhmetov says. "And who needs this! Sometimes you get enough of the pointless struggle—you feel like throwing everything up and working like everybody else, saving your nerves, but working in a link is interesting. We ourselves make good earnings and we give the sovkhos a lot. . . ."

Regardless of his relationship with the manager, the link leader has no doubt of his personal conscientiousness. Moreover, A. Kulakhmetov regards N. Zyblov as a caring and demanding leader who has his own way of caring intensely about the work. Give him the most unbuttoned collective, and with his tough hand Nikolai Nazarovich will quickly bring about order. But, having become accustomed to command the manager does not tolerate independence on the part of his workers, just as he does not tolerate a lack of discipline. And the roster-free link

does not have to be given commands: give it a program, work out its production chart, and be confident that everything will be done as it should be done and when it should be done.

The scattered directions of goals, interests, and responsibility heat up the psychological atmosphere. The roster-free link is responsible for the crop and for decreasing expenditures for raising it, while the division leadership is responsible for the punctual performance on ongoing campaigns. In principle, of course, M. Zybulov and his colleagues could also be held responsible for the crop. This happens from time to time, but always ends without results because the manager has dozens of so-called objective reasons at hand: once the weather ruined things, once the agronomist let them down (and he, as is known, works under the director), and then "Sel'khoztekhnika" did impossibly bad machinery repairs.

And for a failure to meet sowing dates, and for slow harvesting and seed preparation rates—it does not take long to get oneself a reprimand here, and something more serious threatens. Dozens of logs have not been taken today from the central warehouse—tomorrow squeeze them out of the director. The manager constantly has to work himself out of tight spots, frequently moving subordinates from one job to another. The mechanization specialists in the ordinary subdivision are not bothered by this. What is the difference where you work! There will still be a paycheck, and there the work is very hard. In this way a person is trained for "discipline" and . . . indifference to the final results of his work.

It is much more difficult for the manager to command the stubborn "roster-frees." You could make things rough for them, but they will answer: "We have our own work." "You are individualists," Kulakhmetov and his people are reproached, "you do not think about our common cause." The accusations have a serious sound. But beneath them it is easy to discover the most primitive demagoguery, an effort to replace concrete responsibility for concrete work with conversations about the responsibility of all for all when, in essence, no one is responsible for anything, and it is not possible to enforce a strict responsibility upon anyone.

"And what if you shift not the entire sovkhos but a single division to the roster-free system?"—this question arose in a discussion with specialists from the "Zapadnyy."

"What would the manager's work be then?" the people objected.

Indeed? For the time being this problem is not a realistic one for the "Zapadnyy" sovkhos but several years ago it arose in its full weight before the board of the kolkhoz imeni Frunze in Al'menevskiy Rayon. And a solution was found which was as unusual as it was simple: abolish the jobs of overall team leaders. At first there were doubts: how can we deprive ourselves of the pivot on which all of production rotates? Who will give out the duty rosters and control the work of the animal husbandry and field specialists? Production would collapse!

Things did not fall apart on the kolkhoz imeni Frunze. On the contrary, when a chief specialist who shares responsibility with no one for the affairs of the branch becomes the organizer of the production process, the branch management structure, in combination with the roster-free organization of labor in field work and animal husbandry gave a powerful impulse to an increase in yields and animal productivity. Every year the kolkhoz imeni Frunze began to get 1.5 times more grain and feed than the "Zapadnyy" sovkhov, although the kolkhoz's land is evaluated at 55 points, while that of the sovkhov has 66 points. There is nothing to be said about differences in weather conditions: although the farms are located in different rayons, they can quite justly be called neighbors.

When a mechanization specialist has been put in the conditions of a day laborer, then, of course, there has to be constant control over all of his actions. The collective contract and the job contract plus bonus changes him from a day laborer into the master of his situation. Meanwhile, a substantial number of kolkhoz and sovkhov agronomists, not to mention the team leaders of overall teams and managers, continue as a result of long-standing habits to see their chief functions in control and verification of the quality of field work, and in current orders. Frequently we warm up the traditional direction of action by trying to convince and prove from the pages of newspapers that the agronomist's permanent place is in the field where he has to struggle against defective work, and explain to mechanization specialists how and when to sow, plow, and harrow.

"We should not be considered agronomical ignoramuses and taken for mindless actors," the link leader on the kolkhoz imeni Frunze A. Tokapev objects. "And there is no need to control us. It is not that difficult to fool even the most thorough checker, but you cannot fool the land. And with us you get for what you do, and that is why everybody in the collective cares.

"So, you do not need an agronomist at all?" "He is not needed," Aleksandr Yakovlevich continues the thought which he had begun. "If he has become accustomed to command and is capable only of giving orders. That kind of specialist is harmful for the roster-free link. But who, if not the agronomist, will work out a production chart for us, and ensure observance of crop rotations, and who will supply us with high class seeds of promising varieties, and conduct classes on agrotechnics in the winter?!"

In realizing the Food Program, the state is assigning enormous resources for the further development of agricultural production. Another, no less important aspect of the matter, as L. I. Brezhnev said at the May Plenum of the CPSU Central Committee, "is an improvement of production relations so that managerial methods, stimulation methods, and the economic management mechanism create conditions for highly productive labor. The dissemination and perfecting of team contracting is one of the promising directions of the work which has been begun to fulfill the Food Program.

Unfortunately, we newspaper people do not always succeed in going deeply enough into a phenomenon and understanding the inner reasons for its development.

Obviously, because in many of the materials of oblast and rayon newspapers on collective contracting in agriculture there is an excess of information and a shortage of analysis.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatel'stvo "Pravda", "Zhurnalist", 1982

2959

CSO: 1800/296

NATIONAL

MUSLIM SPIRITUAL DIRECTORATES ANNOUNCE DEATH OF BABAKHAN

[Editorial Report] Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 25 December 1982, page 8, publishes the following notice in black borders: "The Spiritual Directorates of the Muslims of Central Asia and Kazakhstan, of the European Part of the USSR and Siberia, of the Transcaucasus, and of the Northern Caucasus with deep sorrow announce that on the night of 23 December of this year after a grave illness died in the 75th year of his life in Tashkent the chairman of the council of the Spiritual Directorate of the Muslims of Central Asia and Kazakhstan sheyk Ziyautdinkhan ibn Ishan Babakhan. The Spiritual Directorates express their sincere sympathy to the relatives and close relatives of the deceased."

CSO: 1800/455

OBKOM SECRETARY ON MULTINATIONAL ASSISTANCE TO NONCHERNOZEM

[Editorial Report] Vilnius KOMMUNIST in Russian No 10, Oct 82 pp 17-23 carries a 5400-word article titled "The Transformation of the Russian Nonchernozem—A Task of the Entire Soviet People" by I. Klimenko, first secretary of the Smolensk oblast party committee. Klimenko argues that the development of the Nonchernozem region is possible only thanks to the cooperation of all nationalities of the USSR. He gives particular attention to the efforts of the Communist Party of Lithuania in whose journal he is writing.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatel'stvo TsK KP Litvy, Vil'nyus, 1982

CSO: 1800/496

TV, RADIO CHANGE FUNCTION OF PRINT MEDIA

[Editorial Report] Moscow ZHURNALIST in Russian No 10, Oct 82 pp 17-18 carries a 1,000-word article titled "What Will Be in Tomorrow's Issue" by Anatoliy Fabrichnyy. The article suggests that radio and television have reduced the current information function of newspapers but have increased the importance of papers as sources of analytic and background information. It notes that in oblast, kray and rayon papers such materials now form 70-80 percent of the paper's content and argues that the readership should be told in advance what will appear in coming issues.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatel'stvo "Pravda," "Zhurnalist," 1982

CSO: 1800/443

REGIONAL

UZBEK SSR: CONSTITUTION, UNION REPUBLIC STATUS

Tashkent OBSHCHESTVENNYE NAUKI V UZBEKISTANE in Russian No 9, 1982 pp 9-16

[Article by U. Sadykov, "Constitutional Regulation of the Competence of the Union Republic"]

[Text] The USSR is a single federative socialist state whose successful development as a whole, as, equally, its constituent union republics, largely depends on the precise delimitation of union and republic competence and its appropriate constitutional regulation. "By competence of the state, M.S. Sharif observed, "should be understood the subjects of its authority (that is, this sphere of social life or the other and the methods of influencing these spheres) and also the concrete powers necessary for realization of the subjects of the authority of a given state."* Proceeding from this, we formulate also the definition of the competence of a union republic as a sovereign state which is incorporated in the USSR and is a subject of socialist federation.

In characterizing the competence of a union republic decisive significance is attached to the fundamentally important constitutional provision to the effect that both the USSR as a whole and all the union republics possess sovereignty and sovereign rights. With all its might the USSR guarantees and protects the sovereign rights of the union republics. The sovereignty of the USSR and the sovereignty of the republics not only are not counterposed to one another but, on the contrary, are in close and harmonious combination and unity.

By the competence of the union republics should obviously be understood:

the spheres of social life in which the activity of the union republics is exercised;

* M.A. Sharif, "Competence of the USSR and the Union Republic (Constitutional Issues)," Moscow, 1968, p 47.

the functions which the union republics exercise with reference to this form or the other;

the concrete competent powers necessary for exercise of their inherent functions; and

indications of the territorial limits of the effect of the competence, that is, of the territory of the union republic, including its constituent ASSR's (in the Uzbek SSR this is the Karakalpak ASSR).

The principles of the competence of the union republics are enshrined in the USSR Constitution--the Basic Law of the single union multinational state--and the constitutions of the union republics. The USSR Constitution and the republic constitutions proceed here from the need for the determination of the competence of the union republics with regard both for all-state and republic interests. Constitutional acts serve in this case as the legal sources of current legislation governing the competence of the union republics. Consequently, the legislative-juridical basis of the competence of the union republics and the system of its regularization are quite broad. In accordance with the position of the union republics in the socialist federation, their competence in spheres of joint activity with the USSR and the exclusive competence of the union republics are distinguished.

The constitutional enshrinement of the competence of the union republic (as, naturally, the competence of the USSR) does not remain frozen and given once for all. It changes both in its content and in its form throughout the existence of the Soviet union state, proceeding from the large-scale social and economic processes and the changes occurring in the country's internal development and its international position.

The building in the USSR of the developed socialist society and the adoption of the new USSR Constitution--the Basic Law of the socialist state of all the people--required the insertion of certain changes in the competence of the union republics also.

These changes are fully in accord with the most important constitutional principles of the delimitation of the competence of the USSR and the union republics, among which are combination of the sovereignty of the USSR and the union republics, democratic centralism and consideration of the singularities of certain branches of legislation and administration.*

The extension of the competence of the union republics in some spheres occurs simultaneously with an increase in the role of the USSR in other spheres of paramount significance for the functioning of our entire union state. This corresponds fully to the interests of the correct, optimum combination of all-union and republic and international and national principles in the organization of the country's economic, social and cultural life.

* M.A. Sharif, op. cit., p 73.

While based on the previous experience of the constitutional regulation of the competence of the USSR and the union republics and preserving the necessary continuity in these questions, the new USSR Constitution and the constitutions of the union republics take an appreciable step forward here.

Together with a strengthening of the union principles of single centralized leadership in questions of all-union significance the new constitutions afford sufficiently extensive scope for the active, enterprising activity of the union republics, reserving for them a broad range of powers, particularly in the sphere of economic and cultural building.

First, the competence of the UzSSR, as of the other union republics, includes entirely new spheres which hitherto were not even mentioned constitutionally like, for example, the development of scientific-technical progress, the rational use and protection of natural resources and others. This is connected with the current level of the country's development, when particular importance is attached to these spheres and for this reason require special mention in the constitutions, particular attention being attracted to them. Second, many of the provisions contained in the constitution and concerning the competence of the union republic are formulated in more generalized form; their content is more capacious. This applies, *inter alia*, to the characterization of the legislative powers of the union republic and its powers in terms of leadership of economic and social development and activity in the sphere of international relations. Third, questions of the country's defense and leadership of the entire USSR Armed Forces are now, with regard for evolved practice, attributed entirely by the USSR Constitution to the competence of the USSR. This fully corresponds to the current tasks with respect to the defense and protection of the sovereignty of the USSR and the maintenance of the USSR Armed Forces at the proper high level and corresponds to the evolved practice of the organization of control in the defense sphere. Fourth, the constitution does not confine the subjects of the republic's authority only to what is indicated in clauses 1-15 of article 74 of the UzSSR Constitution. As distinct from the constitution in force earlier, it contains the direct indication (clause 16, article 74) that the competence of the republic also includes the solution of other questions of republic significance. This fundamentally important provision affords an opportunity for the independent implementation by the union republic within the framework determined by the USSR Constitution of appropriate measures reflecting the specifics of the conditions of the given union republic.

Let us now examine the competence of the UzSSR with regard for its subdivision into spheres of the joint competence of the USSR and the union republics and the exclusive competence of the republic, as propounded repeatedly in literature.*

* See, for example, R. Turgunbekov, "The Statehood and Constitution of Soviet Kirghizstan," Prunze, 1980.

The spheres of the joint competence of the USSR and the union republics encompass the branches of legislation and administration in which the activity of the USSR authorities is exercised in constant and obligatory interaction with the authorities of the union republics, and, in which, furthermore, this interaction has perfectly defined, clearly expressed legal and organizational forms. The daily, strictly coordinated and regularized joint activity of the authorities of the USSR and the union republics is exercised here. In particular, the entire system of union-republic ministries, state committees and departments serves to ensure the proper combination of the leading role of centralized plan-based leadership with the initiative of the union republics and the coordination of all-state interests with the interests of the subjects of the federative Soviet state.

The joint activity of the authorities of the USSR and the union republics in different spheres of legislation and administration by no means signifies parallelism and duplication and confusion of the powers of the USSR and the union republics. On the contrary, it is a question of achievement of the maximum coordination while retaining the predominant role for the union authorities.

The "dual" subordination of the republic authorities representing a concrete expression of Lenin's principle of democratic centralism is applied to the branches of state administration in this case. In the sphere of legislation this means the adoption by the USSR of fundamental legislative enactments and on the basis thereof the promulgation by the union republics of the corresponding codes and laws.

Among the spheres of the joint competence of the USSR and the union republics in the shape of their highest organs of state power and organs of state administration are primarily the extensive list of powers with respect to leadership of the national economy.

Particular mention should be made here of state planning, which is the all-embracing principle of the organization of the national economy and all state activity in the USSR. Its essence is that with the active participation of the working people's collectives the appropriate authorities of the USSR and the union republics draw up and confirm a system of mutually coordinated plans of economic and social development, organize their fulfillment, exercise systematic accounting and supervision and ensure on this basis the unity of actions of all workers of society for the purpose of the building of communism.

The UzSSR Constitution determines clearly that the economy of the UzSSR is an integral part of the single national economic complex embracing all elements of social production, distribution and exchange on the country's territory (article 16). Leadership of the economy is exercised on the basis of state plans of economic and social development, with regard for sectorial and territorial principles and with the combination of centralized management with the economic independence and initiative of the enterprises, associations and other organizations. Active use is made here of cost accounting, profit, production costs and other economic levers and stimuli. State planning is connected with the rational location of production and the plan-based development of natural resources; an improvement in the division of labor

among the union republics and the unification and coordination of their labor efforts; and the correct combination of the interests of the entire multinational state with the interests of each union republic. A comprehensive approach to planning and the adoption of decisions on major national economic problems is of exceptional importance here. Proceeding from the constitutional provisions and current legislation, the UzSSR formulates on the basis of the State Plan of the USSR's Economic and Social Development forward and current plans of the republic's economic and social development.

The republic authorities compile indicators of the comprehensive development of the UzSSR's national economy and the plan of the economy's development for the sectors of republic and union-republic jurisdiction and republic goal-oriented comprehensive programs. Furthermore, the republic submits its proposals with respect to the draft plans of the enterprises, organizations and establishments of union jurisdiction on the territory of the republic.

The UzSSR Council of Ministers and the republic Gosplan submit their proposals with respect to the outlines of the development and location of enterprises of the corresponding sectors of industry developed by ministries and departments of the USSR, on the formation and development of territorial-production complexes and also on the targets for the designing of new and modernization and expansion of operating enterprises of union jurisdiction on the territory of the republic and so forth. Confirmation of current and forward plans of the republic's economic and social development is exclusively within the competence of the UzSSR Supreme Soviet.

The UzSSR Constitution contains most important provisions governing the procedure of the development and confirmation of plans and the exercise of supervision of their fulfillment. At the same time there is currently a need for the adoption of special legislative enactments governing planning in the republics, to which attention has been drawn in literature repeatedly.*

Considerable powers are exercised by the UzSSR in the sphere of material-technical supply and also national economic accounting. In particular, the UzSSR Constitution points out specially that the republic contributes to the implementation of measures with respect to the organization of a single statistical system.

In accordance with the USSR Constitution, leadership of credit-monetary relations is under the exclusive authority of the USSR. Leadership of the financial system as a whole, however, is exercised by both USSR authorities and union republic authorities. Direct leadership of financial work in the republic is exercised by the UzSSR Ministry of Finance.**

* See "The New USSR Constitution and Management of the National Economy," Tashkent, 1979.

** SP UzSSR No 5, 1969, p 44.

As far as finance legislation is concerned, given most important all-union enactments, the union republics have their own laws governing budget rights at the same time. In particular, the Law on Budget Rights of the UzSSR, the Karakalpak ASSR and the Local Soviets of Working People's Deputies of the UzSSR was adopted by the UzSSR Supreme Soviet.*

A most important sphere of the joint activity of the USSR and the union republics is leadership of industry and construction of union-republic jurisdiction. The coordinated and effective cooperation of the USSR and union republic authorities is exercised in the management of industry and construction of union-republic jurisdiction.** Here the union republics have the right to create in place of a ministry or state committee of the same name any other body (main administration, association and so forth) or not create a sectorial organ of administration at all. Naturally, much depends on the exercise of the republics' competence in respect of the management of industry and construction on the concrete singularities of individual sectors.

Agriculture is a most important sector of the national economy, supplying the population with food and industry with raw materials. Its management also constitutes a sphere of the joint competence of the USSR and the UzSSR. Day-to-day leadership of agriculture is exercised by the USSR Council of Ministers and UzSSR Council of Ministers, USSR Ministry of Agriculture and UzSSR Ministry of Agriculture and also a whole number of other union-republic ministries and state committees connected with realization of the Food Program.

All-around joint activity of USSR and UzSSR authorities is exercised with respect to the management of agriculture in questions of planning, financing, material-technical supply, capital construction, capital investments, seed growing, personnel training and assignment, material incentive, implementation of agrochemical measures, operational leadership of the procurement of agricultural products and so forth. In particular, organization of the fulfillment of all-union and republic enactments on questions of the development of agriculture, management of the state agricultural enterprises and direct leadership of the kolkhozes come under the authority of the UzSSR. This makes it possible to embrace all the main aspects of the activity of the kolkhozes and sovkhozes and also other agricultural establishments and organizations in the republic.***

In the UzSSR's agriculture the main sector is cotton growing--the main component of the national economic cotton complex. Implementation of the comprehensive program of the production and processing of cotton is provided for in the republic by a number of ministries, departments and scientific research establishments. This problem is tackled by the UzSSR Ministry of Agriculture,

* VEDOMOSTI VERKHOVNOGO SOVETA UZBEKSKOY SSR No 1, 1961, p 4.

** For more detail see S.N. Dosymbekov, "Problems of the State Control of Industry in the Union Republic," Moscow, 1974; B.Sh. Mirbabayev, "Correlation of the Competence of the USSR and the Union Republic in the Sphere of Management of Light Industry (from Material of the UzSSR)," author's abstract of candidate's degree, Tashkent, 1976.

*** See "Legal Problems of the Leadership and Management of Agriculture in the USSR," Moscow, 1979.

Ministry of Cotton-Cleaning Industry and Ministry of Light Industry, the Central Scientific Research Institute of Cotton Industry and others.

The UzSSR State Committee for Supply of Production Equipment for Agriculture acts as an independent union-republic body providing for the supply to agricultural enterprises of equipment and mineral fertilizer, the organization of the maintenance and repair of agricultural equipment and the training and improvement of machine operators.*

Leadership of irrigation work and the use of available irrigated land is entrusted to the union-republic Ministry of Land Reclamation and Water Resources. The Ministry of Fruit and Vegetable Industry, which is designed to deal not only with the production but also shipment, storage and processing of vegetables and fruit, was created in 1981.**

Soviet trade serves as an important link of the economic connection between city and countryside and different sectors of the national economy and areas of the country. The leading place in the internal trade of the USSR is occupied by state trade (approximately 70 percent of the entire retail commodity turnover). Cooperative trade, which is exercised by a ramified system of consumer cooperative societies, mainly serves the country's rural population. Kolkhoz trade provides for the sale of surplus agricultural products produced by the kolkhozes and sovkhoses.

Leadership of trade falls into the sphere of the joint competence of the USSR and the UzSSR, and, furthermore, union authorities--the USSR Council of Ministers, USSR Gosplan and the USSR Union-Republic Ministry of Trade--have an important role here. At the same time, however, the republic has quite extensive powers with respect to the leadership of trade and public catering and exercises direct control of the trade enterprises and organizations under its jurisdiction via the UzSSR Ministry of Trade and the republic Union of Consumer Cooperative Societies.

As the evolved practice of the development of legislation and administration and also most important provisions in the constitution testify, it is primarily the management of republic industry and construction which is attributed to the exclusive competence of the UzSSR in the sphere of the economy. Local and fuel industry, housing-civil construction and others are included here. All enterprises of industry and construction of republic significance are under the authority of the corresponding republic ministries and departments. In accordance with the UzSSR Constitution, the republic exercises leadership of the associations and enterprises of republic jurisdiction.

At the same time there is a republic Ministry of Local Industry, which exercises overall leadership of this sector. Direct management of local industry enterprises is exercised by the local soviet ispolkoms via the corresponding ispolkom administrations and departments.

* See SP UzSSR No 22, 1978, p 284.

** Ibid., No 3, 1981, p 64.

The control of river and motor transport and also a certain part of pipeline transport (the republic oil and gas pipelines) is under the exclusive authority of the republic.

The republic has considerable powers in the sphere of the building, repair and maintenance of roads of republic and local significance. The republic organizations perform a great amount of work here.

A most decentralized sector of the national economy, whose management and regulation are concentrated under the authority of the union republics, is housing and municipal services. The management of housing and municipal services, housing construction and the civic improvement of cities and other centers of population is exercised by the UzSSR Council of Ministers and the Ministry of Housing and Municipal Services.

A wide-ranging program of the development of housing and municipal services and the civic improvement of cities and centers of population is being implemented in the republic. In connection with the adoption of the Fundamentals of Housing Legislation of the USSR and the Union Republics we now have to draw up and promulgate the UzSSR Housing Code. Thus legislation in this sphere acquires a strikingly expressed union-republic character.

Leadership of consumer services is within the exclusive competence of the republic. Consumer services have now become a major, technically equipped sector of the national economy. The Ministry of Consumer Services is the central sectorial authority in the sphere of management of consumer service.

A considerable place in the sphere of the joint competence of the USSR and the union republics is occupied by socio-cultural building. The USSR and the UzSSR exercise extensive and diverse activity in the sphere of leadership of public education, science, culture, health care, physical culture and sport and also social security.

Just from this list of sectors of socio-cultural building, in respect of which the competence of the USSR and the UzSSR is realized, it can be seen what big and complex tasks in the sphere of legislation and administration confront the highest organs of state power and administration of the republic, tasks in the process of whose accomplishment it interacts closely with the union authorities.

Here the USSR, as in other instances also, exercises overall leadership, by which should be understood determination of the basic directions of the development of socio-cultural building, formulation of a uniform social policy, determination of the most important principles of legislation, development of scientific-organizational principles and supervision of the activity of the corresponding union and republic organs of administration.

Direct leadership, however, and also the operational control of socio-cultural building are exercised by the union republics in the shape of their highest organs of state power and administration and also the republic sectorial and functional organs of administration, ministries, departments and state committees.*

Importance is attached in the accomplishment of the manifold tasks of socio-cultural building to a consideration of local, national singularities connected with the multinational composition and everyday life of the republic population and the existence within it of the Karakalpak ASSR.

In accordance with Lenin's national policy, the possibility of use of the native language and the language of other peoples of the USSR is constitutionally enshrined and really guaranteed in the UzSSR. At the same time the necessary measures for study, together with the native language, of Russian as a most important medium of inter-nation communication are being implemented consistently.

In accordance with the constitution, the UzSSR, in the shape of its highest organs of state power and administration, exercises leadership of public education, the cultural and scientific organizations and establishments of the republic, health care, physical culture and sport and social security and caters for the upkeep of historical and cultural monuments (clause 13, article 75). The UzSSR Council of Ministers exercises leadership of socio-cultural building, develops and implements measures to ensure the growth of the people's culture and the development of science and technology and participates in the implementation of the single policy in the sphere of social security (clause 1, article 22 of the UzSSR Constitution).

The corresponding functions of the Council of Ministers are determined more fully by the Law on the UzSSR Council of Ministers.**

A ramified system of union-republic and republic ministries and state committees whose nomenclature is determined by the Law on the UzSSR Council of Ministers operates for the accomplishment of current tasks of socio-cultural building in the republic. This consists of the ministries of education, higher and secondary specialized education, television and radio broadcasting, cinematography and publishing houses, printing plants and book trade; and the UzSSR Council of Ministers' Committee for Physical Culture and Sport, the Ministry of Social Security and others.

As far as legislative regulation in the sphere of socio-cultural building is concerned, in recent years republic laws have been enacted in the UzSSR, in accordance with the all-union Fundamentals of Legislation Governing Health Care and Public Education, concretizing the provisions of union legislation with reference to republic conditions.***

* See "Control of Socio-Cultural Building," Moscow, 1980; A. Akhmedshayeva, "Organization of the Control of Culture in the Light of the New USSR Constitution," OSHCHESTVENNYE NAUKI V UZBEKISTANE No 10, 1981.

** VEDOMOSTI VERKHOVNOGO SOVETA UZBEKSKOY SSR No 36, 1978, p 527.

*** Ibid., No 36, 1970, p 426; No 22, 1974, p 249.

At the same time, as noted in literature, the USSR's promulgation of fundamental enactments with reference to the development of culture, science and the press and the enactment of the corresponding republic laws on the basis thereof would be of positive significance under current conditions.*

Ensuring state security, maintaining official procedure and protecting citizens' rights and liberties, leadership of the activity of the justice authorities and also the exercise of foreign policy activity are among the spheres of the joint competence of the USSR and the union republics in the field of state buildings.** In particular, in the sphere of foreign policy activity the UzSSR, in accordance with the constitution, represents the UzSSR in international relations, ratifies and denounces international treaties of the UzSSR and appoints and recalls diplomatic representatives of the UzSSR in foreign states and international organizations. The republic has a Ministry of Foreign Affairs. Extensive work on maintaining relations with foreign states is also performed by the republic societies of friendship and cultural relations with the peoples of foreign countries and other state and public organizations.

Under the exclusive authority of the UzSSR with reference to state building are the adoption of the republic constitution and changes thereto, supervision of observance of the UzSSR Constitution and ensuring that the Karakalpak ASSR Constitution correspond to the UzSSR Constitution; submittal for ratification by the USSR Supreme Soviet of the question of the formation of new autonomous republics and autonomous oblasts; determination of the procedure of the organization and activity of the republic and local organs of state power and administration; and amnesty and pardons for citizens sentenced by the judicial authorities of the UzSSR. The republic independently decides all questions of its administrative-territorial arrangement. This ensues directly from the articles of the USSR Constitution and the UzSSR Constitution. At the same time works devoted to problems of the administrative-territorial arrangement have recently repeatedly proposed all-union regulation of the basic provisions characterizing the principles of administrative-territorial arrangement, the most important criteria of classification of centers of population, optimum indicators for different types of administrative-territorial unit and so forth.*** This would be of positive significance, it seems.

The UzSSR adopts the appropriate legislative enactments on the question within its competence. Such, for example, are the Law on the Council of Ministers, the laws on elections to the Supreme Soviet and the local soviets, edicts on

* See V.I. Shibaylov, "Control of Socio-Cultural Building in the Union Republic," Minsk, 1974; G.A. Dorokhova, "The Constitution as the Basis of a Further Improvement in Legislation and Administration in the Sphere of Culture" in the collection "The USSR Constitution and the Further Development of Constitutional Studies and the Theory of Law," Moscow, 1979.

** See for more detail A.N. Mikhaylov, "State Building of the UzSSR at the Current Stage," Tashkent, 1973.

*** See M.A. Sharif, "Constitutional Principles of the Administrative-Territorial Arrangement of the Soviet Socialist State" in the book "Constitutional Principles of State Building," Sverdlovsk, 1981; Yu.N. Nikitin, "Administrative-Territorial Arrangement of the Union Republics and an Improvement of its Legislative Regulation (on the Basis of Material of the Latvian SSR)," author's abstract of candidate's degree, Minsk, 1978; V.A. Kadyrov, "Administrative-Territorial Arrangement of the Union Republic," author's abstract of candidate's degree, Tashkent, 1979.

the classification of centers of population, the procedure of changes in the administrative-territorial arrangement and others. Thus the very nature and federative structure of the Soviet multinational union state ensures the full possibility of the expedient determination of the competence of the USSR and the union republics with the harmonious combination of all-state interests with the interests of all its constituent union republics.

"A careful consideration of the interests and requirements of each nation and nationality," the CPSU Central Committee decree "60th Anniversary of the Formation of the USSR" says, "their organic combination with the interests of the Soviet people as a whole and unification of the working people's efforts in the accomplishment of the urgent tasks of society's development--all these are at the center of the CPSU's attention."*

The fraternal friendship and increasingly close rapprochement of the socialist nations, the high understanding of nationwide tasks and the wise Leninist national policy of the CPSU are contributing to the effective exercise of all-around coordination and cooperation between the USSR and the union republics and the consistent embodiment and creative development in the single union state of all the people of the principles of democratic centralism, socialist federalism and Soviet democracy.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatel'stvo "Fan", 1982

8850
CSO: 1830/99

END

* PRAVDA 21 February 1982.

END OF

FICHE

DATE FILMED

JAN 24, 1983

B